

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 3 July 2018

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan) took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Bills

SENTENCING (RELEASE ON LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SUPPLY BILL 2018

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Condolence

CONDOUS, MR S.G.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:18): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr Steve Condous, former member of the House of Assembly and Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

In speaking to this motion it is with a touch of sadness at Mr Condous's passing but also, I have to say, as someone who knew him over a long period of time, it certainly brought back for me many fond memories of my interactions with Mr Condous over a long period of time.

Steve Condous was born in December 1935. He was educated at Adelaide Boys High School. He studied pharmacy at the University of Adelaide. He was a self-employed wholesale health food distributor and then, of course, served with distinction on the Adelaide City Council for 25 years, and for six years as the Lord Mayor of the Adelaide City Council between 1987 and 1993.

I am not sure whether he was the first of the lord mayors—I suspect he was not—there was, of course, a subsequent lord mayor who went on to parliamentary office for the Labor Party. He not only won preselection for the Liberal Party in the western suburbs seat of Colton but held that seat for eight years from 1993 to the commencement of 2002. He served as parliamentary secretary to the minister for housing, urban development and local government relations in the period of 1996, and then became parliamentary secretary to the premier from 1997 through to 2002, when he retired from state parliamentary office.

Steve Condous' life story is a very interesting life story, when one reads not only his maiden speech but the numerous clippings that the parliamentary library has provided to us. As for many members in parliament, not just the South Australian parliament, his experiences as a young person in South Australia and Australia governed many of the attitudes he adopted, both in his personal community and, ultimately, his political life.

I will only refer to one of the media articles in 1998, which would have been soon after he had been re-elected at the 1997 state election. The headline was (and I want to read the first few paragraphs) 'Childhood torment of the Greek boy who became Lord Mayor. They spat at Dad and called me dago'. The story was written by a name we will all be familiar with, Annabel Crabb, who has gone on to lofty heights at the national level in terms of media and journalism. Annabel, at the

time, was a junior reporter at the *Adelaide Advertiser*. Annabel wrote the story, and let me quote the first few paragraphs:

Liberal MP Steve Condous remembers when his family members were spat on in the streets of Adelaide. And he is 'terrified' Australia might revisit the 1950s, when, he says, he was repeatedly bashed and called 'dago' because of his Greek background.

Yesterday the 58-year-old former lord mayor interrupted a formal speech to denounce the call by the One Nation Party for a return to the social standards of the 1950s.

'Well, that's fine...but let me tell you, as an Australian of Greek parents who migrated here in the early 1930s, that it was an Australia that I don't want to know any more', he told a gathering at the Stamford Hotel on North Tce.

'At seven years of age, I saw my father being spat at in the streets and being called a dago. I grew up only 500m from here in an area that was called the working-class ghetto of Adelaide. I went to school at Sturt St (Primary School), and I was abused daily both physically and verbally, and I'd come home with my shirts torn and bloodied because I'd been in a fight because I couldn't stand what I was being called.'

That is a not unfamiliar story of migrant families, in particular the sons and daughters of parents who migrated to Australia, not just to South Australia, during that particular period. As I said, it governed a lot of what Steve Condous felt passionate about in his personal community and, ultimately, in his political life. He felt strongly about these issues and, at the rise of One Nation, he, together with a number of other members of the Liberal Party and from the Labor Party, rose up and spoke out against the rising tide of support there was for One Nation at that particular point in our history.

It was a fair indication. As former minister for education, as a result of the State Bank disaster, I had the sorry task of having to cut expenditure in the education department. One of my decisions was for the closure of the Sturt Street Primary School, which at its height had taught all the former members who I ran into on a daily basis at the West Adelaide Football Club, I might admit. Doug Thomas and I think half of the West Adelaide supporter base had been educated in the west end of Adelaide and had attended Sturt Street Primary School.

They told me that that very small school—which, on recollection now, probably had less than 100 students back in the nineties—had had more than 1,100 students in the primary school, crammed into the same classroom spaces, and that more than 50 and 60 to a classroom was not uncommon for the young people. But they loved the school, and Steve Condous, Doug Thomas and, as I said, half of the West Adelaide Football Club, constantly reminded me of the folly of my ways in terms of closing their alma mater.

Steve Condous was a passionate advocate for a range of issues. I talked about the experiences he had as a young person, and that his family had, which governed his views in relation to migration issues, fairness issues and, at that stage, to the role of One Nation, but he was a forceful speaker and advocate for a whole range of issues. Certainly, within our parliamentary party room, I remember when the minister at the time—I suspect it was either minister Evans or Brokenshire, I cannot remember—introduced the original emergency services levy legislation, which was ultimately supported by both houses of parliament. He and a colleague of ours in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Julian Stefani, were passionate participants—let me put it that way—in that particular debate. They warned, I guess, of what treasurer Koutsantonis, I think it was, did just four years ago: that at some stage it would be used to remove the remissions and be used as a land tax provision.

They had very strong views about the importance of the family home to not only their families but the families and the communities they represented. They argued against land tax on the principal place of residence back in that period leading up to the Tonkin government of 1979-1982 when there were public meetings of many hundreds across metropolitan Adelaide arguing against land tax on the principal place of residence. They raised significant concerns as they participated in the debate privately, and also publicly, about the emergency services levy.

His passion right across the board meant that he spoke forcefully. He was one of the early outspoken advocates for football at Adelaide Oval on Friday nights. The media articles trace a quite public spat with Max Basheer, the then head of the South Australian National Football League. They crossed paths publicly in a passionate way, arguing, as has indeed been the case, that AFL football on a Friday night at Adelaide Oval would be part of a revitalisation of Adelaide as a city and, in particular, the central business district. He spoke publicly, passionately and proudly against those,

as he would term them, 'vested interests' who were opposing AFL football on a Friday night at Adelaide Oval.

There are many other issues that the press clippings from the library demonstrate, and I will not go through all of those. He was elected in 1993 for an eight-year term, as I said. He was part of the class of 37 Liberals who were elected. Ten Labor members were elected after the State Bank disaster, so he was part of that huge tidal wave of members who came into electorates, in many cases, which had never been represented previously by a Liberal member of parliament. He, together with other colleagues in the western suburbs, like Heini Becker and others—

An honourable member: Joe Rossi.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Joe Rossi and others. Joe was another example of a first-time member. Heini Becker, of course, was someone who had been elected successfully in the western suburbs for a number of elections. These were a new wave of Liberals in the western suburbs who, as was the case with Steve, knew their communities and argued passionately on behalf of their constituents in the parliament and in the public.

He knew his electorate like the back of his hand but, unlike members of the Legislative Council whose electorate of course is the whole of the state, he did not know the parts outside the metropolitan area quite as well as the regional areas of South Australia. There was one very famous story, which a number of my colleagues will be familiar with. Both Labor and Liberal members are familiar with the love-ins, or meetings, that we have prior to a parliamentary session, and we happened to have one in the lovely regional city of Port Pirie.

Of course, members of the Legislative Council had no problems at all getting up there and getting back. As members will note, as you come onto the main highway, you can either turn left or you can turn right. Members of the Legislative Council, of course, know that you turn right to come to Adelaide. Members who do not know the regional areas quite as well perhaps turn left and end up in Port Augusta before they work out that perhaps they should have gone in the other direction.

Steve would never have made that mistake in relation to his own electorate because he knew it like the back of his hand, but perhaps he should have taken some advice from some of his Legislative Council colleagues in terms of the regional communities of South Australia.

As I said, he was a lovable character in the party room and a fearsome advocate for what he believed in. He was not a shrinking violet in terms of being unafraid to express his views, whether or not he agreed with the parliamentary leadership at the time. He lived through tumultuous times in the Liberal Party where there were battles going on for control of the parliamentary Liberal Party. He spoke up passionately on many occasions in relation to what he saw as the nonsense and divisiveness within the Liberal Party at the time and the fact that it would be a recipe for many years in opposition, and he was indeed correct.

He lived many years after his parliamentary career concluded and continued to be engaged with a number of members of the Liberal parliamentary party. He was not active publicly in terms of a public profile, but continued to express his views to certain members of the Liberal Party and the parliamentary party right through until recent years.

On behalf of my colleagues, I pass on my sympathies to Angela and his surviving family. Certainly, he was much loved by the Liberal Party. We acknowledge his service not only to his former electorate, community and family but particularly to the Liberal Party as an organisation and to the parliament as an institution.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I rise today to support the condolence motion for Mr Steve Condous, the former Lord Mayor of Adelaide and former Liberal member for Colton. Let me start by saying that, on behalf of Labor members in this place, our thoughts, condolences and best wishes are with Mr Condous's family during what is a very difficult time.

It was interesting and instructive to go back and read Mr Condous's first speech to parliament. I think many people in their first speech set the tone for many of the things they carry out throughout their public life. Mr Condous touched on many themes that are still relevant and important

today: the importance of small business, the vibrancy of the CBD, the growth of tourism and multiculturalism. Indeed, I understand that Mr Condous was one of the very first mayors of Greek descent in Australia. As I said, these themes are still relevant today. The areas that Mr Condous championed, both as a parliamentarian and Lord Mayor and in his personal life, still remain relevant.

He was strong and independent minded, even without a sense of direction in the regions as we have heard today, doing what he saw best, which meant occasionally crossing the floor on parliamentary votes for his beloved electorate and for this great city of ours. Mr Condous was also a champion of things like the Central Market, where I am told he spent some time selling his wares on occasion at a cake stall. He was a very vocal defender of the Adelaide Parklands.

He was also a mad-keen footy fan and, in rereading his first speech, he took great delight in pointing out the financial difficulties that the Richmond Football Club was experiencing at the time, something that I will try to not hold against him too much. In February 1995, Mr Condous moved a motion, as the leader of the government in this place, calling on football to be played at Adelaide Oval. It is something that he championed on many different occasions in many different forms. It was a fantastic idea then and something that is reality now, and that gives you a sense of the vision of the man. He was a champion of playing football at Adelaide Oval even before the Hon. Terry Stephens had the idea and made it happen.

Mr Condous was a strong local member and was heavily involved in his community. He was patron of Heartbeat at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, patron of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club, patron of the Henley Football Club, patron of the Henley Surf Life Saving Club, patron of amputee sports and Chairman of the Desert Pea Foundation.

In concluding, I think it is fair to say that Mr Condous's drive, ambition, advocacy and vision has made Adelaide and South Australia a better place and for this he will be well remembered. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:35): I rise to associate myself with the comments made by the Hon. Mr Lucas on behalf of Liberal members, and I do so as the only other current Liberal member in the parliament to have served with Mr Condous. I well remember his contributions in the joint party room, some of which were highlighted by my leader a few moments ago.

There are a couple of amusing things that I remember very well about his time here that coincided with mine. The leader has just reflected on the famous trip home from Port Pirie via Port Augusta. As much as I agree with the leader in saying that very few members of the Legislative Council would have ever done that, Mr Condous at least was happy to confess to the joint party room that he had done it when I think that many people would have kept it to themselves.

We all wondered why he did not work out, as he drove towards Port Augusta, that having had the sea on his left-hand side when he went to Port Pirie why it was still on his left-hand side when going home. I think, as the leader said, his geography skills outside of metropolitan Adelaide and particularly Colton were not as strong as they were for some of us.

Another matter I remember very fondly was the annual Blessing of the Waters at Henley Beach. On Saturday night last some of us heard a former premier, the Hon. Rob Kerin, relate the embarrassing story he had at the Blessing of the Waters at Glenelg, where he had the misfortune of the dove dying in his hands and the subsequent embarrassment about it. In fact, one young friend of his would not even let him hold his baby.

About 12 months after that event I was asked to represent the premier at the other Blessing of the Waters at Henley Beach. I very well remember Steve Condous—I do not know where Steve was but I was there to represent the premier—telling me beforehand that as I was new to the parliament he did not want me embarrassing anybody. He said, 'You know, this is what you've got to do to make sure you don't do what Kerin did.' He also gave me the now very well-known advice: whatever side of the Greek community is running the Blessing of the Waters, they always have spare doves now.

Can I say that I do remember Steve Condous very well, particularly even before his parliamentary career, as a very strong advocate for the City of Adelaide. I recognise that he was

awarded an AM. He is well regarded throughout many facets of the South Australian community. I indicate my condolences to Angela and the family.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): I rise to speak about the extraordinary, colourful and distinguished life of Steve Condous AM, a great servant and fiercely parochial ambassador of our city and our state, who died on 22 June, aged 82. As those who knew Steve will attest, to describe him as larger than life probably does not do him justice. His sheer presence filled a big room. He was loud, and he loved it. He was opinionated, especially when it came to footy, cricket and politics. He was intelligent, successful and he was street smart.

Above all, Steve was a modest man who never forgot his roots and hard upbringing in the city's west as the son of battling migrants from the Greek island of Kastellorizo. Steve was one of the most generous and giving civic leaders I have had the pleasure to know, along with his loving wife of 49 years, Angela. There are a couple of stories I would like to share that seem to embrace his gregarious yet affable persona.

I first came across him when I was knee-high to a grasshopper—and you may joke that I still am. I was following the West Torrens Eagles at Thebarton Oval and watching my childhood footy idle, the mercurial triple Magarey Medallist, Lindsay Head, in the sixties and seventies. We watched games from the same spot, alongside the cyclone wire-roofed players' race, where fans could cheer and jeer as teams emerged. Not a good idea, Mr President. While I did not know him then, it was impossible not to be aware of him. Steve was so loud with his one-eyed barracking that the running joke was that he could wake up the dead at the nearby Hindmarsh Cemetery.

Legend has it that the Eagles recognised his unique talent as an abrasive 19th man, encouraging him to sledge opposition star players in the hope of putting them off their game. In those days, supporters could go onto the field at three-quarter time and gather around the huddle of players to hear the coaches' final commands. Steve was known to make his way to the opposing team and let fly with a rancid spray. One who copped his ire the most was Neil Kerley, when he was player-coach of Glenelg. How Steve never copped a knuckle sandwich from Knuckles is still a mystery.

Ironically, their paths crossed again when King Kerley came to coach West Torrens in the late 1970s. By that time, Steve was a permanent fixture at Thebby and had the job of fundraising to help pay for Kerley's huge contract. As the story goes, Steve organised a so-called gentleman's evening, replete with exotic dancers, roulette wheels and poker chips. All was going to the bawdy script until the sound of police sirens and screeching brakes suddenly sent men and scantily clad women scattering in all directions into the darkened streets of Panorama. Steve successfully made his getaway. He only had to scamper into his home right next door, leaving his hapless neighbour to face the music and save West Torrens from embarrassment.

Footy was a big part of his life. He was a founding member and a coach of Henley Greek in the amateur league. Never one to let an opportunity pass him by, he would send them on runs after training, armed with his leaflets to distribute during election campaigns. He also loved the Adelaide Crows and was still upbeat about their topsy-turvy season. Last Saturday night, with five straight losses looming, they needed a last quarter miracle. Now, I would not be surprised if the ghost of Steve Condous made himself heard at the three-quarter time huddle of the West Coast Eagles.

Steve never got to finish his pharmacy degree at Adelaide Uni because he was needed to support his family. He became a successful businessman in the food industry and was a canny property investor. Local government proved to be his true calling, spending 25 years as an Adelaide city councillor and as Lord Mayor for six years, the first from a Greek background. He was passionate about the city, increasing its population and protecting the Parklands. We in the media dubbed him 'the people's mayor' because of his down-to-earth, unpretentious and genuine approach. He had no time for elitism.

Nothing demonstrated that more than during the royal visit of Prince Charles and Princess Diana in 1988. Steve and Angela were to host a civic reception for the rock star royals, and Town Hall drew up his guest list, made up of Adelaide's who's who and wannabes. As his wife Angela recounted to me, when Steve saw it he ripped it up in indignation and instead drew up his own list of ordinary people from working-class backgrounds who would never have got the chance to be so

close to royalty, let alone the most famous couple on the planet at that time. That act impressed the normally cynical and hard-bitten Fleet Street press corps.

Another of those unheralded acts of kindness and generosity came to light while I was reading a sympathy card in his home. One year, Steve invited an underprivileged family to be his guests of honour on the Lord Mayor's stand to watch the Christmas Pageant. Not only that, Steve also bought them new clothes and shoes to wear on the day. Steve and Angela became an institution for their philanthropy and relentless charity work, raising millions of dollars for various causes, including homelessness and victims of domestic violence.

The other love of Steve's life is his daughter Stacey. He and Angela went through years of heartache and frustration trying to adopt Stacey as a baby from South America, and he later became a vocal critic of Australia's harsh adoption laws. The proudest day of his life came when he walked Stacey down the aisle and then toasted her and her new husband at the reception at the brand-new Adelaide Oval, where he loved watching footy and cricket. As far back as 1996, Steve called for AFL to be played there, much to the chagrin of the SANFL. How things have changed.

Steve never lost an election he contested, winning two terms in the other place as the Liberal member for Colton. While he could talk politics until the proverbial cows came home and tell you what was wrong with the world, Steve told me he never really felt comfortable about being an MP because he loathed toeing the party line and selling two-bob policies like the emergency services levy, which he strongly opposed. Steve will forever hold a dear and special place in my life. It was Steve who introduced me to my wife Angela in 1995, changing the course of our lives, and for that we will be eternally grateful. I commend the motion to the house.

The PRESIDENT: May I add my own condolences to the family. I ask honourable members to stand in their places to carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:48 to 15:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Reports, 2017—

University of Adelaide Erratum—Page 13

University of South Australia

Government Response to the Occupational Safety and Rehabilitation Committee's 30th Report

Regulations under the following Acts—

Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988—Fees

Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Fees

Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000—Fees

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996—

Fees

SACAT

Building Work Contractors Act 1995—Fees

Burial and Cremation Act 2013—Fees

Conveyancers Act 1994—

Fees

SACAT

Co-operatives National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—Fees

Coroners Act 2003—Fees

Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007—Fees
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979—
 Dangerous Foods Transport—Fees
 Fees
 District Court Act 1991—Fees
 Emergency Services Funding Act 1998—Remissions—Land
 Employment Agents Registration Act 1993—Fees
 Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993—Fees
 Evidence Act 1929—Fees
 Expiation of Offences Act 1996—Fees
 Explosives Act 1936—Fees
 Fair Work Act 1994—Representation—Fees
 Fees Regulation Act 1927—Public Trustee Administration Fees
 Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017—Fees
 Freedom of Information Act 1991—
 Exempt Agency
 Fees
 Gaming Machines Act 1992—Fees
 Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017—Fees
 Land Acquisition Act 1969—SACAT
 Land Agents Act 1994—
 Fees
 SACAT
 Land Tax Act 1936—Fees
 Liquor Licensing Act 1997—
 Fees
 General Fees
 Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—Fees
 Magistrates Court Act 1991—Fees No. 2
 Partnership Act 1891—
 Fees
 SACAT
 Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995—Fees
 Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995—Fees
 Public Corporations Act 1993—Southern Select Super Corporation—SACAT
 Public Trustee Act 1995—Fees
 Relationships Register Act 2016—Fees
 Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995—Fees
 Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995—Fees
 Sheriff's Act 1978—Fees
 South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013—
 Fees
 Fees No. 2
 Stamp Duties Act 1923—Exemption
 State Records Act 1997—Fees
 Supreme Court Act 1935—Fees
 Work Health and Safety Act 2012—Fees
 Youth Court Act 1993—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Aquaculture Act 2001—Oyster—Fees
 Development Act 1993—
 Fees
 Open Space Contribution Scheme
 Fisheries Management Act 2007—Fees

Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—Facilities Levy
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—
 Expiation Fees
 Fees
Livestock Act 1997—Fees
Local Government Act 1999—
 Fees
 SACAT
Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—
 Fees
 SACAT
Mining Act 1971—Fees
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—
 Accident Towing Roster Scheme—Fees
 Expiation Fees
Opal Mining Act 1995—Fees
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000—Fees
Plant Health Act 2009—Fees
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes) Act 2004—
 Egg—Fees
 Meat—Fees
 Plant Products—Fees
 Seafood—Fees
 Seafood—Fees No. 2
Private Parking Areas Act 1986—Fees
Road Traffic Act 1961—
 Miscellaneous—Expiation Fees
 Miscellaneous—Fees

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Adoption Act 1988—
 Fees
 SACAT
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978—Fees
 Children's Protection Act 1993—Fees
 Crown Land Management Act 2009—Fees
 Disability Services Act 1993—Assessment of Relevant History—Fees
 Environment Protection Act 1993—Fees
 Heritage Places Act 1993—Fees
 Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981—Fees
 Housing Improvement Act 2016—
 Fees
 Revocation and Transitional Provisions
 Marine Parks Act 2007—Fees
 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Fees
 Native Vegetation Act 1991—Fees
 Natural Resources Management Act 2004—Fees
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989—
 Fees
 SACAT
 Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982—Ionising Radiation—Fees
 Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992—Fees
 Water Industry Act 2012—Fees

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Controlled Substances Act 1984—
 Fees
 Poppy Cultivation—Fees
 Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005—Fees
 Firearms Act 2015—Fees
 Food Act 2001—Fees
 Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010—
 Amendment of Law No. 2
 Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009—Fees
 Police Act 1998—Fees
 Retirement Villages Act 2016—Fees
 South Australian Public Health Act 2011—Fees
 Summary Offences Act 1953—Fees
 Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997—Fees

Ministerial Statement

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:05): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Attorney-General on the subject of an ex gratia payment made to Mr Henry Keogh.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Marshall Liberal government is committed to establishing a high dependency unit to support the expansion of services at Modbury Hospital. Since being appointed, I have met twice with groups of clinicians at Modbury to discuss service developments at the hospital. Following those discussions, the government is developing plans to expand in a staged way the range, volume and complexity of surgical procedures at Modbury Hospital.

When the council last met on 21 June 2018, the Leader of the Opposition asserted in a question that I had misled parliament in answer to a question regarding the Modbury Hospital high dependency unit. He contrasted a tabled answer to a question on notice with a statement taken out of context to suggest that I had told this council that the advice I received from my department did not raise concerns in relation to a stand-alone high dependency unit at Modbury. The written answer stated:

I can confirm I received advice from SA Health indicating in the absence of establishing a new intensive care unit at Modbury Hospital, appropriate levels of clinical safety may not be achieved with the establishment of a stand-alone high dependency unit.

That statement is consistent with my earlier statements to the council. On 15 May 2018, I advised the council that:

There was advice from the department that raised concerns about patient safety in relation to an HDU.

I restated that fact on 17 May. In the answer to the question on notice tabled in this place, I confirmed that I have received advice that appropriate levels of clinical safety may not be achieved with the establishment of a stand-alone high dependency unit. The leader has asked about the nature of the advice. For the sake of clarity, I advise the council that the key concerns raised in the briefings were:

- the cost of establishing and operating an HDU, both capital and recurrent;
- the cost of establishing specialist care to support an HDU;

- the ongoing need for patients to be transferred to the Lyell McEwin or Royal Adelaide Hospital for specialist care, following high dependency unit care;
- staff may be tempted to manage seriously unwell patients on site rather than transfer them expeditiously to a more appropriate setting;
- recruiting staff to the Modbury HDU in the past was problematic, increasing the use of agency staff which may increase the risk to clinical safety;
- the potential low volume of patients requiring the HDU may mean clinicians are unable to maintain their skill set to safely care for patients, unless NALHN clinicians rotated between Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals;
- a small HDU at Modbury Hospital would not be accredited for training by the College of Intensive Care Medicine, making it difficult to attract appropriately skilled staff; and
- smaller high dependency units often have worse clinical outcomes than larger units.

I will continue to engage with clinicians to ensure that these and any other issues are addressed as we deliver on our commitment to the people of the north-eastern suburbs to establish a high-quality, clinically safe, high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital.

ECARL NOTIFICATIONS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:08): On behalf of the Minister for Child Protection, I table a ministerial statement on eCARL notifications.

DISTRICT POLICING MODEL

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): On behalf of the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services in another place, I table a ministerial statement on district policing models.

Question Time

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question regarding Aboriginal housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr President, 1 July often marks a new beginning in many different ways: new programs, a new financial year, and new opportunities. Sadly, though, 1 July 2018 has marked the first day in over a decade where South Australian Aboriginal remote communities knew that they do not have the support of their new government, the Liberal government, when it comes to their future housing needs. There has been a flurry of media releases and media reports from both the Western Australian and Queensland governments, providing updates on the status of their negotiations of new NPARIH agreements, but there has been deafening silence continuing from South Australia. My questions to the minister are:

1. Pursuant to the expert panel that the federal government convened on the issue, can the minister advise how many new houses will need to be built in remote Aboriginal communities over the next 10 years and their cost?
2. What is the funding amount and/or split that the minister has requested between the state and federal governments?
3. Has the federal government made any offer of funding to the state government to this date noting media reports of the federal minister, Nigel Scullion, that a deal is imminent?
4. Given the gravity of this issue, what communities has the minister visited to discuss the issue?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his important question. He really does like to land his own former government in the poo, so to speak, for their lack of action on this—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Well, I am sure that they do. I hope that they do.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I hope that they do.

The PRESIDENT: Can the minister not have indirect dialogue with the Leader of the Opposition, and can the Leader of the Opposition not bait the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: It is true that the former agreement has expired on 30 June. My understanding was that it provided some \$290 million, perhaps a little bit more over a 10-year period. It was entirely commonwealth funding and, for a long time prior to that agreement, the federal government was seeking some input from the former state government in relation to what funding the then state government was prepared to put on the table.

The \$290 million reminds me of another figure that was talked about during the election campaign which was the tram to Norwood that nobody wanted, so I would just like to point out for the benefit of readers that in the lead-up to the election campaign I am not aware that the state government provided any money on the table, or provided any money through its costings document to solve this important issue of executing the remote housing agreement.

Indeed, I have a copy of a draft letter, which I'm not sure was ever written because it is not signed, but it was drafted on behalf of the Hon. Zoe Bettison, who was the then minister for social housing, writing to the Hon. Nigel Scullion, Minister for Indigenous Affairs. I won't quote the entire thing, but it says—and I can't be sure that it was ever sent:

As part of the Housing and Homelessness Ministers' Agreement in Adelaide on 19 May 2017, Housing Ministers from Queensland, Northern Territory, Western Australia and South Australia met to discuss remote housing issues, including the future of funding for remote housing beyond 30 June 2018.

Noting that the agreement ends on 30 June; 'we seek an urgent meeting with you', etc.; the date proposed is 23 August 2017.

I make those remarks to the council just to say that the former government was well aware that this funding agreement was due to expire. The Leader of the Opposition may well be able to enlighten the house himself. He may wish to make some sort of explanation as to whether, as a member of the former cabinet, he was aware that there were funding issues brought to cabinet and whether negotiations were taking place, because certainly in the time that the Marshall Liberal government has been in place we have had a number of things come to cabinet, including the recent homelessness and housing agreement, which I unfortunately had to defer signing in order to try to execute this issue of remote housing which, unfortunately, delayed some of the confirmation to the sector that their funding was available, even though I had written to them in April just to let them know that funding was going to be available.

So it is really unfortunate that we have found ourselves in this situation. I have advised that I have met with Mr Scullion. I am not prepared, and I've said this before—and I am not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition is actually hard of hearing or not—but I'm not going to detail the negotiations prior to their conclusion. That would not be a sensible approach to take, so that means I am not going to talk about data or where things are at. But, suffice to say, we are negotiating in earnest and we are doing a great deal more than the Labor Party ever did in its time in office to try to resolve this issue.

Having been fully aware that the remote housing agreement was due to expire, what on earth did they do? During the election campaign, when they were throwing \$290 million for a tram at Norwood that nobody wanted, where was their commitment to remote housing in that context because that would have gone a long way to assisting to resolve this issue?

It's really quite hypocritical of the Leader of the Opposition. Having been a member of the former cabinet, hopefully he was aware of discussions that took place at cabinet level—one can only guess—but what on earth was he doing to try to execute these things? I am doing everything that I can. The officers in my department and Treasury officials are doing everything that we can to execute

this matter as rapidly as possible, and when we have some information it will be made publicly available in the usual manner.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:25): Supplementary arising from the answer: does the minister have any idea at all how many new houses are estimated to be needed over the next 10 years and is she aware of what federal department conducted the expert review on this?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:25): Thank you for the supplementary question. Those questions are somewhat germane to the negotiations and therefore I'm not going to be going into detail about—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: They're not. It's a published document. You don't know what department. You don't know what number. Just say you don't know.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Why don't you just sit and listen.

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: If you don't know, just say. If you have that little interest, just say you don't know.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Just calm down and listen to the answer.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Ridgway, I don't need your assistance in my role.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, quiet. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I'm just at a loss with the Leader of the Opposition. He thinks he knows everything and yet he doesn't. One wonders what his government did. I think it would be nice for the Leader of the Opposition to come clean about what discussions took place in the lead-up to the expiry of this important agreement about whether cabinet approved any funding going forward and whether there were any discussions going forward.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You are the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, I am the minister and I am negotiating in the best—

The PRESIDENT: Do not engage with the Leader of the Opposition. Do it through me.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I apologise, Mr President. We are negotiating in the best interests of South Australians and people living in remote communities and information will be made available once these matters are concluded.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:27): Supplementary arising from the answer: what communities has the minister visited to explain her government's inaction?

The PRESIDENT: I will take the first part of the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What remote Aboriginal communities has the minister visited to explain the status of negotiations?

The PRESIDENT: Thank you, Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: It's not a supplementary. It's a restatement.

The PRESIDENT: No, it's an acceptable question. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:27): I haven't had the opportunity to visit any remote communities yet. I am hoping to be able to do that as minister, but we have had a very ambitious 100-day plan as a new government with all of us new ministers, apart from the Treasurer. We had a very ambitious 100-day plan with a lot of changes to be made prior to

the end of the financial year. I am very pleased that we have been able to fulfil all of those promises and I am hoping to get out and about and visit a whole range of communities.

TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Have any staff lost their jobs as a result of the transition to the new Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment and, if so, how many?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. As of 1 July, the new Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment was formed. I had the pleasure this morning of having a meeting with a gathering of that department. Not all of the staff were there, but well over 150 people were in the room. It was good because, of course, it's a new beginning with a new minister and a new approach to the outward looking agencies for selling, marketing and growing our state's economy, which is the job that the Premier has asked me to do.

The new chief executive of Trade and Investment, Mr Mike Hnyda, the former head of Investment Attraction, explained that he was putting together an implementation task force. I think he is hoping to complete that today. I don't have any further information for the member. We are still going through the whole range of reorganisation of the department and we expect to be on the ground, growing our economy, getting more tourists, selling more products and making South Australia a better place to live as of today.

TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:29): Supplementary: have any units or programs been discontinued from 1 July and, if so, which ones?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:30): There are only two and they are not so much units or programs but the Investment Attraction Board members were advised that their terms would finish on 1 July or 30 June, and also the Health Industries Board the same. They are the only two that we have advised will not be continuing.

As to the others, at this stage we are still going through the processes. We are implementing our election commitments which, of course, the members opposite would be aware of: five new trade offices, sporting international education, the entrepreneur visas, the international student hub—there is a whole range of things that we are working through with the department to implement. However, at this point in time we are still negotiating the actual outcome or the way they will take place. As to the entrepreneur visas, we are still in negotiations with the Department of Home Affairs federally for the actual mechanism that will work. That is a pilot program that we are very much looking forward to implementing.

TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:30): Further supplementary arising from the original answer: minister, you mentioned the implementation plan. When can staff expect to know if they have jobs or whether their jobs are at risk?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:31): It's an implementation task force that I think the chief executive is appointing today. They will be working through all of the issues in relation to the new agency probably as from first thing tomorrow morning.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister provide details about successful freight-only airports similar to the government's proposed GlobeLink?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:31): I thank the honourable member for her interest in freight-only airports. I am pleased to also note that she comes from a regional part of South Australia and has an interest in regional South Australia. I think she is referring to the GlobeLink announcement and policy that we have already gone out to market to get somebody to do the \$20 million business case for. There were three components, as I

commented upon some weeks ago I think, in answer to a question from the Hon. Mr Hanson in relation to the rail.

The freight-only airport is a potential component. We have an airport that was zoned in that area from, I suspect, an idol of the members opposite and a Labor Party hero, the former premier Don Dunstan, when he and his team came upon the idea of developing a satellite city at Monarto. Maybe there are parts of what he tried to do but he was just ahead of his time perhaps. However, there was an airport zoned in that particular part of the state. It seemed logical to the government that if you were looking at having an Adelaide Hills road bypass and a rail bypass and you have some land that is already zoned for an airport—and The Rural City of Murray Bridge is doing a master plan for the airport because they felt that it was a sensible thing to do.

We saw some reckless behaviour, like the MATS plan years ago, where the Labor Party sold off the land for the north-south corridor, and it is going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. I think the Hon. Steele Hall once said in a letter to the editor or in an opinion piece that he thought that was the most damaging thing the Labor Party had ever done to South Australia's economy—that is a big statement given what they did with the State Bank—to sell that off.

One of the reasons that we have identified that airport—I was a bit sidetracked talking about the MATS plan, but it's the same principle—is that we have a piece of land that is set aside. We always said that it would be an airport and it was set aside and planned and zoned to be an airport. The two families or farmers who still own it are well aware of that particular rezoning and they still farm it and it is still in private hands.

Our policy at the time was that we should preserve that land and when the business case has been done for the road bypass and the rail bypass, if the opportunities exist for the private sector to invest in an airport and make it—and our view was that we should not be competing with the passenger terminal at Adelaide Airport. Our view is that it probably would be just a freight-only airport, a bit like Wagner's airport at Toowoomba, the Wellcamp Airport. That was a freight-only airport. I know they do have some passenger activity there now, but pretty much it is a freight airport.

It was always our view that a freight-only airport in a logistics sort of hub, an intermodal facility, where trucks, trains and planes might all come together, makes sense. It is part of the GlobeLink policy. The tender has gone out for someone to do the business case—the \$20 million election commitment. From our point of view, it makes sense to look at it. You should preserve that land and use it for what was intended in the seventies by the Hon. Don Dunstan and his team when they were in government.

I might just add, Mr President, while I am on my feet, while I think of it, the Hon. Mr Hanson did ask me questions around whether I had spoken to ARTC about GlobeLink, and I couldn't recall. I had this feeling I had met with them, and I have met them since that time was well. I met them during late April and then I met with them just recently. They think that the GlobeLink bypass may be a real benefit to them. It's Great Southern Rail, not ARTC; it's Great Southern Rail I am talking about. I got my acronyms mixed up. They currently run the trains: obviously, the *Ghan* that comes down through Alice Springs, Katherine and they stop at quite—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, I'm allowing you considerable—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, I know, but this is about GlobeLink.

The PRESIDENT: No, do not overspeak me. I know you are passionate about the issue. I have allowed you a tremendous amount of latitude. Wind this answer up.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I will wind this up. Great Southern Rail thought, if it could bypass along the back of the hills somewhere adjacent to the Barossa, they would be able to offer a stop where their patrons could get off and do a tour through the Barossa and then get back on the train and come in to Adelaide, so they actually saw it as a benefit.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:36): Supplementary: I will just read the question back to the minister because I don't think it was actually addressed.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, I am going to allow it because I gave considerable latitude to the Hon. Mr Ridgway, and he went on his own journey. So, Hon. Ms Bourke, please ask your question.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I would like to go on a journey, a journey about what common sense actually is. Can the minister provide details on successful freight-only airports like the one that you are proposing, GlobeLink? What other successful—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Is there another airport?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Is there another successful airport? Just to make it a bit clearer, is there another successful freight-only airport?

The PRESIDENT: Because your answer was so effusive, I think it arises out of your original answer—somewhere.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:37): It's there somewhere. I apologise for going on the journey I went on. At the time that we looked at Wagner's airport at Toowoomba, which was designed to be a freight-only airport, they were exporting freight from south-east Queensland and other parts of the east coast, so that was the model we based it on. I think there might be some passenger activity there now, but it was genuinely set up as a freight-only airport in the first instance.

KANGAROO ISLAND TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:37): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the Minister for Tourism please update the chamber on some of the stars at the recent Kangaroo Island tourism awards and how they are contributing to a bright tourism future for the island?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in tourism and especially Kangaroo Island. I was honoured on 15 June to attend and speak at the Kangaroo Island Food, Wine and Tourism Awards. The inaugural event was held in 2016, so it is only the third time it has been held. This year, I think over 100 people came to the Dudley Wines cellar door at Penneshaw. I might add that I had a quick family lunch there during my Christmas holidays. It is a spectacular part of the state and I can recommend the Dudley Wines cellar door to anybody.

The Kangaroo Island Food, Wine and Tourism Awards celebrate the island's world-class food, wine and tourism industries. Kangaroo Island, as members would know, plays a key role in South Australia's tourism industry, offering international, interstate and intrastate visitors a variety of world-class experiences. Amongst the winners, there are a few I should single out. Eliza Sheridan-Turner won Kangaroo Island's Rising Star Award. I think this is fantastic. She is a young and passionate individual who is taking on her family business of Emu Bay Lavender. The prize is that she will get to spend a week at Southern Ocean Lodge, learning from all the people there about world-class tourism and tourism facilities. I think it is a wonderful thing where the locals are supporting each other, giving them an opportunity to increase their skills.

Another winner was Wandering Souls, which won the best new tourism business. They set up a canvas tent, a glamping experience, like I have never seen before. This tent was almost like a palace, Mr President. They are all over the island so that visitors can immerse themselves in a whole new level of nature, but in comfort.

Mr Craig Wickham was awarded the Outstanding Contribution by an Individual, and it is impressive to see how much he has offered to the KI tourism industry and helped the island flourish as a tourism destination. He is doing a lot of work overseas to raise the island's profile, and it was a pleasure to see him win that award.

The Kangaroo Island dining award also went to the Mercure Kangaroo Island Lodge. I made sure that the next time I was there—which was only last week for the Kangaroo Island Tourism Industry workshop 'Meet the Minister'—I stayed at the Mercure and enjoyed a very pleasant meal. I can understand why they won the Kangaroo Island dining award.

There were also a host of other operators who won awards for their work: Emu Ridge Eucalyptus Distillery, Dudley Wines cellar door, Table 88, Kangaroo Island Ocean Safari, Kangaroo Island Free Range Eggs and False Cape Wines. Our latest visitor numbers show that Kangaroo Island remains a strong destination of choice, with the region welcoming some 148,000 international and domestic visitors. Importantly, these visitors injected \$123 million into the local economy, supporting local businesses and jobs.

The awards night acknowledged all the hard work and passion behind these statistics. I am really encouraged to see the next generation, a new generation of island people, stepping up to the plate and taking the industry's future very seriously. It was great to see a lot of young people participating in the awards, and young business owners.

Likewise, the island's stalwarts have been enthusiastically mentoring the new generation of business owners. Kangaroo Island has a great tourism future and great community fabric. I will be very excited to see the emerging tourism offerings next year. Incidentally, they had a quiz on the night of questions that the participants had to answer. There were 15 really tough questions about Kangaroo Island tourism. I thought I would be a generous minister, and I said that for the winner I would—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, Leader of the Opposition. Sit down, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, there is a point of order.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Hon. Dennis Hood asked a very specific question about awards; it had nothing to do with quizzes. I appreciate that you gave the minister a lot of latitude last time, but it was a question that the Hon. John Dawkins wouldn't tolerate an answer this long to, and I don't think we should put up with it either.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have only about 15 seconds to go.

The PRESIDENT: I am going to uphold the point of order.

COMMISSIONER FOR KANGAROO ISLAND

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:41): Can I ask a supplementary question of the minister? You can add that to the quiz list. Can the minister reveal if there are plans to end the role of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:42): There was an election commitment to review and end the position of Kangaroo Island commissioner. The Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is working through that process, and there will be a transition plan in place so that no-one on the island feels like they have been disadvantaged by that decision. So it's not something that is going to go bang and happen overnight. There will be a transition in place.

While I am on my feet, I would like to mention to people that I offered a prize for the people who won the quiz—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, Leader of the Opposition. You are in defiance of me; sit down, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I have a question; that was a supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I know it's a supplementary. Out of the response?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, that was out of the response.

The PRESIDENT: You asked a supplementary, did you?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: Okay. The Hon. Mr Pangallo.

CARDIAC SERVICES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade, about delays to see cardiac specialists in our hospitals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Today, heartbroken Anne Copson and her husband Geoffrey, laid to rest their 18-year-old granddaughter, Keira Morello, whom they raised in care along with Keira's two siblings. Keira's death was untimely and unnecessary. She died in her sleep on 19 June from a genetic heart condition called long QT syndrome, which had only been diagnosed on 13 June after she collapsed on a night out and was taken to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Doctors there had picked up an irregular heartbeat and her grandparents were told that she was an urgent category 1 patient and perhaps needed a defibrillator.

After four days, Keira was discharged with medication and a heart monitor and was referred to the Lyell McEwin Hospital to see a cardiac specialist. But, the hospital told Kiera she had to wait until the end of September, or it was suggested to her GP that she could see a specialist in Norwood sooner if she went as a private patient. But it was too late for Kiera. Long QT syndrome is an irregular heartbeat disorder known to cause sudden death and, while it is incurable, it is very treatable and Kiera could have looked forward to a long life. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why was such a high-risk patient like Kiera sent home when it appeared to treating doctors she needed urgent surgery?
2. What is the length of waiting to seek cardiac and other specialists at all our major hospitals?
3. Does the minister believe it is acceptable that a teenager with her life ahead of her was let down by our health system, and will he order an urgent independent investigation into the nature of Kiera's death?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:45): I am aware of the case that the honourable member refers to. My deepest sympathies are with the family of the young woman. I am unable to comment further as the Coroner is, I am advised, investigating the case. In relation to the member's comment in relation to waits at outpatient clinics, I refer him to the SA Health website where, as of this last weekend, we are publishing the information he seeks.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:46): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier. Can you inform the council of the consultation process undertaken to select the new members of SAMEAC?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:46): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. The selection process is very thorough. We consulted across the board with many community leaders and they have come up with a list of recommendations. Since then, of course, the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Steven Marshall, member for Dunstan, in the other place, has made an announcement in the selection of new board members.

If I may indulge the council I will provide the list of the new board members that were selected, because I think it is great to highlight the qualities and calibre of the these board members. Norman Schueler was appointed as the chair of SAMEAC. Most of us would know Mr Norman Schueler. He is well-known in the Jewish community for his extensive business experience and valuable qualities in assisting the commission throughout the time that he has been with SAMEAC. Now he now continues to serve as the chair of SAMEAC. We are proud of him.

The deputy chair is Mrs Antonietta Cocchiaro. I think she is very well known to the chamber—many of you would know her. She is—

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Ms Scriven. Can the Parliamentary Secretary please sit down and I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The assistant minister is providing information that is already in the public domain. The question was in regard to consultation.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I have some sympathy for the point of order. Can you please consider the point of order when responding to the question?

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Certainly, Mr President. I have answered the question earlier in saying that it was a broad consultation with multicultural community groups across the board in South Australia to select and appoint those very high-calibre board members for SAMEAC.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:48): Supplementary: considering the importance and the very strong cultural and community focus of SAMEAC, did you advertise the expression of interest out in local newspapers?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:49): No advertisement was done in the public domain. However, consultation was across the board. I wonder when the Labor government advertised to have Grace Portolesi appointed as the chair of SAMEAC previously.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:49): A supplementary: as the government is undertaking a review of SAMEAC, wouldn't it have been more appropriate to have left the existing members on the commission until the completion of the review when the government could then match the new board with the skill sets identified in the review?

The PRESIDENT: I'm allowing the question. Parliamentary secretary.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:50): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. We have a new government in town. We will do with a new direction, so there are areas of consultation done in accordance with the new government's direction.

SA HEALTHY TOWNS CHALLENGE

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding preventative health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Most members will be aware that I have spoken many times in this chamber and out in the general community about the importance of preventative measures when it comes to suicide and related mental health issues. Will the minister update the council on general health preventative measures?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government was elected with a strong commitment to preventative health. When medically possible, most people would rather be at home in a familiar place close to friends and family than in a hospital bed, however well-appointed and however good the quality of care. The government believes that, while South Australians should have access to high-quality service provision in hospitals, it is better for the individual and for the public health system if people keep healthy and any illness is effectively managed so that they do not require hospitalisation. The government wants to make it easier for South Australians to stay healthy.

One platform of this approach is the Healthy Towns Challenge which the Premier launched last week in Whyalla. The Healthy Towns Challenge will provide five grants of up to \$50,000 each to five regional communities in the state to assist in the implementation of preventative health strategies. The communities applying will partner with a not-for-profit organisation with experience in the health and wellbeing sector in order to deliver projects with a prevention focus and addressing local health needs.

Examples of the sorts of projects which might receive funding through the Healthy Towns Challenge are the establishment of a farmers' market or community swap meet to increase access to affordable and healthy food, conducting screening for type 2 diabetes or skin cancer, replacing or upgrading sporting or playground equipment in the community, providing healthier food options in canteens and for functions, and, acknowledging the honourable member's interest, it may well be for a suicide prevention program.

These are just some of the ideas put forward to begin the conversation on preventative health in South Australia's regional communities, and I look forward to finding out what other creative ideas come forward from South Australians to deliver better health outcomes through preventative programs. The funding of \$1 million over four years represents an investment in the future of health in South Australia. The programs funded will offer measurable results and will provide immediate benefits to the community.

Maintaining good health and wellbeing is a shared responsibility between individuals, government and communities more broadly. This program is a demonstration of the government's belief in local communities and the importance of government engaging with communities and delivering better health outcomes.

SIMPLIFY BILLS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:53): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer as Leader of the Government in relation to Simplify bills.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Towards the end of the previous government, a legislative technique designed to reduce unnecessary red tape and anomalies was introduced in the form of two Simplify bills. On face value these bills appeared to be non-contentious; however, it now seems that dark forces were at work within various government departments to sneak things through that diminished community rights and which I suspect they hoped would go unnoticed if they were buried amongst hundreds of amendments to dozens of acts.

One such issue in the first Simplify bill last year related to amendments to the Crown Land Management Act and provided that waterfront Crown land could be sold off or leased to private developers without public consultation provided that a thin coastal strip was excised from the land first.

This is precisely what the government is now doing on Kangaroo Island. Using the provisions of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Act 2017, at least 10 hectares of conservation zoned, waterfront Crown land near Pelican Lagoon on Kangaroo Island will lose its protected status and be leased to a golf course developer, who will clear native vegetation and replace it with putting greens, fairways and other golfing infrastructure.

My question of the leader is: will the current government continue with the policy of the previous government of introducing omnibus Simplify bills during this term of parliament?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You supported that bill.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: I know I did. I got it wrong. I got it terribly wrong.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:55): That sounded like a confessional. My recollection is that the Hon. Mr Parnell supported the legislation in the simplify bill that went through.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: I've now discovered how sneaky they were.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I don't think we needed a simplify bill to make that particular judgement about the former government. With the greatest of respect to the Hon. Mr Parnell—and I hold him in some esteem at least for being a Greens member of parliament around the nation; I hold both the Greens members here in some esteem—I am sure he didn't need a simplify bill to know that the former government was sneaky in relation to its approach to issues. As I said, the honourable member did support the legislation, as indeed did the former opposition, now government. But my recollection is that we did—and I look anxiously at my colleague—move a number of amendments in the Legislative Council as it related to the tourism area and a number of areas.

One of the jobs of parliament and the Legislative Council in particular—it's an important role of the Legislative Council—is to not allow governments, sneaky or otherwise, to get things through. This should be the last thing I should have to put to the Hon. Mr Parnell, because I know he shares my views about the importance of the role of the Legislative Council, but the Legislative Council has an important role to play as a house of review so that sneaky, tricky governments of whatever flavour or complexion are subject to appropriate review in the house of review, which is the Legislative Council.

The Liberal opposition, as it was then, together with crossbenchers, did have the numbers to make amendments, and we picked up a number of provisions which we thought that sneaky government was trying to get through, and we sought the support of the Legislative Council to correct those particular provisions. If, in retrospect, the Hon. Mr Parnell slipped up, if that is his confessional—

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: I'm not saying that.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It sounded like it. It sounded like a mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa coming from the honourable member in relation to the legislation. But as a general principle, we are not opposed to the notion of reducing red tape and regulation, so the government's approach of a simplify bill I don't think in and of itself is sneaky. So I don't think you can dismiss the notion of having a bill there.

I think the challenge for each of us as members is to hold those pieces of legislation up, if we have any doubts about them, and to consult. That is certainly what we did. Each shadow minister—and we concede we have greater numbers to do this sort of task than crossbenchers do—were required to consult with all stakeholders in their area in relation to the pieces of legislation to say, 'Okay, do you have concerns in relation to what the government is attempting to do in this particular area?' We did have some concerns expressed to us and we then moved some amendments in the Legislative Council to those provisions.

My recollection is that I think there was a simplify bill of a second nature which was before the parliament. I can't remember whether it arrived at the Legislative Council or not. Certainly, it is the new government's intention probably to dust that off and have a look at it. There were some sensible provisions in it, so I am advised, potentially to proceed down the path, but we are still looking at an approach.

Perhaps we can forewarn the Hon. Mr Parnell that it is possible that the former government's simplify bill No. 2, if that's what it was called, which has been out in the public arena at least for 12 months now, may well be proceeded with in whole or in part by the new government and that is fair warning to have a close look at what the former government might have been trying to sneak through and see whether or not the honourable members' constituents have any concerns in relation to any aspect of the legislation.

In conclusion, in and of itself I don't see that there is a problem in relation to deregulation removing red tape; in fact, that's what the new government is about. The various mechanisms are quite open: you can have 50 separate bills all doing a little bit each, or you can have one reduce red tape bill, and in and of itself I don't see that that is necessarily a problem. We will consider both options as we proceed with our deregulation program.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:00): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Will the minister detail the key performance indicators or performance targets of overseas trade offices and the key performance indicators and performance targets they will be expected to reach and maintain as a measure of their worth and economic gain that they will bring to the state of South Australia?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (16:00): I thank the honourable member for his keen interest in overseas trade offices. He has always been interested, I suspect, in things that happen overseas. In relation to the overseas trade offices, the targets and KPIs (key performance indicators) he talked about, as I mentioned, it is only 3 July today, so it is three days that the new agency has been in place. I have not yet had a formal meeting with

the chief executive in relation to that, but I assure the honourable member that we will be an outcome-focused government.

I think we saw last time that the trade minister was probably more input focused, rather than output focused. We had the large trade missions—200-plus people on these trade missions. I am advised that there is a figure of some 300 MOUs signed by the last government—maybe not all attributable to the former trade minister. Very few of those have delivered any outcomes. But, it would be seen at the time that we had signed 10 MOUs on this particular trade mission and we had done a great job, but they have not amounted to very much at all, although one or two have.

It was interesting: I remember the Hon. Gail Gago signed one to establish two clean food centres in Fushun. I asked questions, sitting where the Hon. Kyam Maher is, as opposition leader about that and was hauled over the coals by the minister the next day, met the chief executive and was told that I was damaging business and damaging China. Well, these things never, ever happened. However, I will add that there were two young gentlemen from, I think, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia's electorate who have a winery and have just opened a cellar door in Fushun as a result of that, so it took about seven years and one business was able to open a cellar door there.

So we will be focused on outcomes; we will have some clear goals, but we want to grow the economy and grow the number of international students, grow the number of immigrants to grow the population, grow exports and grow tourism numbers. So there is a whole range of targets and KPIs that we will set, but none have been set at this point.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:02): A very quick supplementary based on the original answer: when will you do that?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (16:02): Some time over the next 12 months.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:03): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services about her regional meetings in the Riverland. Can the minister update the chamber about the domestic and family violence forums in the Riverland?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (16:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, last Friday, the assistant minister, Carolyn Habib, and myself, along with the Office for Women, travelled to the Riverland to host the first of the regional round tables into domestic and family violence issues. This follows on from our initial round table, which was held in Adelaide with a range of service providers. This particular round table was expanded from service providers to include a number of state government agencies, including South Australia Police and Housing SA.

We had probably in the order of 20 or 25 local people attend. It was facilitated by SAPOL and it highlighted the differences in implementation of a range of issues that were part of the government's policy that we took to the election. I think it is fair to say that in regional areas obviously each region is different—the services are different and the gaps in services are different—but the way that a lot of people operate in this space is quite cohesive. They have very good informal and formal networks between them.

There were a couple of issues that were of particular interest, such as the disclosure scheme, which is often referred to as Clare's Law, which is to commence on a trial basis from 1 October this year. There were a number of logistical issues that were raised by participants on what particular information would be disclosed, etc.

We received advice from the police officers who attended that often in a regional community there is a lot of awareness of somebody who has a violent history, and it is a matter of trying to explain to a potential new partner sometimes that they need to be careful and that there are certain behaviours that they need to be aware of. But in many senses, because of the privacy issues at the moment, without this particular scheme being implemented, police are quite limited in the sorts of

warnings and information that they can provide, so they are very keen on seeing this matter being implemented.

There was also discussion about the safety hubs and what that might look like for the Riverland region and, again, in relation to crisis accommodation, what sort of facilities might be needed in the Riverland. We are very grateful to everybody who participated. As I have said continuously in relation to this process, we are very keen to shape the rollout of the policy in collaboration with all the partners, the non-government organisations, SA Police and other state government and federal government agencies so that we get the complexion of these things right. We will continue to go out to the rest of the regions to undergo a similar process, and I thank everybody for their participation.

LOW-FLOW BYPASS SYSTEMS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services, representing the Minister for Environment and Water, questions regarding low-flow bypass systems.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In the government's election policy document entitled 'Natural Resources Management—Empowering Communities' they outline that the federal government has supported a series of low-flow bypasses in the Angas and Bremer catchments in the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges through funding of \$12 million from the Flows for the Future Program. This was estimated to cover 90 per cent of total project costs, with state funds to make up the remaining 10 per cent to provide up to 500 low-flow bypasses.

I have been advised that some natural resources management officers are telling landowners that the South Australian government intends to make installation of these systems compulsory during 2019 and that landowners will be required to contribute to the cost. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister advise how much government money has been spent on low-flow bypasses to date, providing a breakdown for state and federal funding?
2. Can the minister advise how many landowners have expressed an interest in the scheme and how many low-flow bypass systems have been installed?
3. Are there any intentions to transition the program from being voluntary to mandatory?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (16:08): I thank the honourable member for that question. I think there has been quite a lot of dialogue within this chamber in relation to low-flow bypasses, which have had somewhat of a contentious history. It is an issue that I know the honourable member has raised with the previous government and was subject to some potential amendments to the last round of amendments to the Natural Resources Management Act. I pay tribute to our former colleague, the Hon. Rob Brokenshire, who was quite concerned about this issue as well.

For the benefit of honourable members, low-flow bypasses are devices that can enhance environmental flows. Particularly during drought conditions, they are sometimes installed on dams and other watercourses so that there will be some environmental flow to maintain the environmental assets. I visited a range of different devices in the Clare Valley some years ago and the feedback from some of the farmers was quite sceptical about them silting up and so forth.

I am aware that the federal government funded this program, I think, in the previous financial year and funding was provided to the Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board, but in relation to those specific questions that the honourable member has raised, I will take those on notice and seek some information from the Minister for Environment and bring it back.

MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:10): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister confirm that his secret report on meningococcal B recommends that the

state should establish a vaccination program for five year olds and 15 to 16 year olds and, if so, will he act immediately to put this into operation?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:10): I thank the honourable member for her question. It's hardly a secret report. I publicly announced that I was commissioning it in April. I have given updates right through the last week or two about the progress in the report. What I can advise is that the government is currently working on a meningococcal B program to best protect the South Australian community from this deadly disease and we will be in a position to make a statement shortly.

MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:10): Supplementary: where can the public find a copy of this report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:11): As I indicated, the government is currently working on a meningococcal B program. The report will be released after the government has made an announcement.

MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:11): Further supplementary arising from the answer: when will the report be released and therefore when will the government be making this announcement on this secret report?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:11): As I have said, the government will be making the announcement shortly.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hood.

INDEPENDENT WATER PRICING INQUIRY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:11): My question is to the Treasurer. The government has just announced an independent water pricing inquiry. What is the proposed time line for the inquiry and when will consumers see results of the inquiry and the impact?

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:11): Thank you, Mr President. I don't need the assistance of the Leader of the Opposition answering my questions, with great respect. I thank the honourable member for his question. As the member would be aware, the government appointed a person with unique skills to conduct the independent water commission inquiry in Lew Owens, a gentleman who has been appointed by both Liberal and Labor governments to significant positions over the years but, more importantly, in relation to this particular position, he has been on both sides of the argument.

He has been a distinguished former chair of ESCOSA, the Essential Services Commission, the independent regulator, but on the other side of the fence, he is a former chair of the SA Water Corporation Board, so he actually knows what the SA Water Corporation gets up to. He knows what is in its accounts. He knows all the detail of the SA Water Corporation, so in Mr Owens I think we are very lucky to have a person with a unique blend of skills to conduct the inquiry.

The inquiry will commence as soon as is possible. It is intended to be reported no later than about June of next year. The timing issues are important for members to be aware of, in that the independent regulator, the Essential Services Commission, has set a series of regulatory arrangements for price increases for this current period, under the former Labor government, which was from 2016 to 2020. So the impact of any results of the inquiry from the independent commissioner and then any decision the government takes—because ultimately it's a decision for the government and then ultimately the independent regulator, ESCOSA, as in relation to water pricing they have the final decision—will be impacting on consumers from the period 2020 to 2024.

ESCOSA has already commenced its work for that decision to take impact from 2020 to 2024. They have outlined a program of work that they have to undertake for a period of basically two

years from around about now through to when the decision will be announced so that it can take effect from July of 2020 for the period through to 2024.

So the independent commissioner's report will inform the government in relation to the terms of reference which are part of the public record—I won't repeat them here—in terms of the regulated asset base, the weighted average cost of capital and a variety of other issues like that. He will report to the government, the government will then make a decision in relation to what, if anything, it does in relation to the pricing order that the Treasurer is required to issue, and that is an important input for, finally, the independent body, the Essential Services Commission, to make a decision in setting water prices for the period from 2020 to 2024.

It is a long process. It is an inevitable by-product of having an independent regulator setting water pricing. We hope that ultimately it will lead to lower water prices for consumers and businesses in South Australia because this government was elected on a program of growing the economy, growing jobs in South Australia and, to do so, we have to reduce the cost of doing business in South Australia. With the Treasurer's hat on, looking on the SA Water Corporation as a never-ending cash cow for the pockets of Treasury and the budget, it is very tempting from a Treasurer's viewpoint, but from a growing jobs viewpoint and from struggling families trying to pay their bills viewpoint it is not the approach that this government wants to adopt.

It is possible that the end result of all of these complicated processes might mean, hopefully, lower water prices and it may well mean lower dividends coming into the state budget from SA Water. That means that the amount of money that the government has got to pay for services will obviously increasingly need to be targeted, efficient, economical and deliver results, rather than the sort of wasteful expenditure, throwing money at anything that moved financial management approach that the former Labor government adopted, sadly, over 16 years at a cost to the budget and at a cost to the people of South Australia.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about the GST.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Renowned Australian economist Saul Eslake was quoted in the national broadsheet this morning warning that changes to the GST distribution would risk American-style inequality between states. This was on the back of growing speculation that the Prime Minister will later this week announce a new funding model for distributing the GST between the states. Under the new model all states except Western Australia would lose significant GST funding. In SA's case, we stand to lose a massive \$557 million a year in GST funding.

Mr Eslake warned that, while transitional funding was expected to soften the blow, at least in the short to medium term, there was no guarantee that top-up funding would be sustained and that inequalities between Australians, based on where we live, would deepen. Mr Eslake stated:

I have a lot of concern. One is the abandonment on the principle that has been around since 1936: that no matter which state or territory they live in, Australians are entitled to similar standards of public services in exchange for similar levels of state taxation.

This principle is one of the reasons why the gaps in living standards between Tasmania and Western Australia, large though they are, are a lot less than the gaps between Mississippi and Massachusetts.

Mr Eslake went on further to say that, if legislation was required to change the way the Grants Commission distributed the GST, coalition senators from states and territories other than Western Australia should cross the floor to defeat it—a strong test indeed between state allegiances over political leanings. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Has the Treasurer sought guarantees from the federal government that South Australia will not lose more than \$550 million a year in GST funding?
2. Has the Treasurer been briefed yet on the impact that the new GST funding model will have on the state?

3. What assurances has the state government received that future commonwealth governments will not renege on future GST funding?

4. What impact will this funding deficit have on the state budget?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:19): I am delighted to respond to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's question because, clearly, he and I and the government are on exactly the same team: we are on team South Australia in relation to the GST. The Hon. Mr Pangallo can feel very comfortable with the fact that this government, prior to the election and since the election, has publicly and unashamedly put the view that we will put South Australia first in relation to the GST funding deal. We have been long-time supporters of the current arrangements. Indeed, as I have indicated to this house before, many years ago I had the good fortune, together with John Olsen, to sit down at the table with former prime minister John Howard and former treasurer Peter Costello and sign the original GST funding intergovernmental agreement.

It has served South Australia well. We acknowledge the fact that the former Labor government supported the current arrangements, but, as is their wont, they strut the public stage in relation to trying to change the federal government's position on all issues, whether it be this, health funding, or whatever it is. As we have indicated on a number of occasions, we have adopted the grown-up, adult way of going about negotiations and discussions. We have made quite clear both publicly and privately what our position is as a state government. We will not be accepting any deal which takes \$557 million or, indeed, any similar sum from South Australia.

South Australians can be assured that the South Australian government will continue to stand up for South Australia. As we have indicated, whether it is a federal Labor government or a federal Liberal government, we will put the interests of South Australia first. In relation to the GST deal, there is a no more important issue for our future financial arrangements in South Australia than to have a good resolution to GST deal.

The only other thing I would say in relation to this is we acknowledge that, thus far, we have had very productive and respectful discussions with our federal colleagues, including between the Prime Minister and the Premier, and I have had discussions with the federal Treasurer. Indeed, we have shared interests with some of our interstate colleagues as well, who hold treasurer positions in other states. There have been ongoing negotiations and discussions in this particular area. Whenever the federal government gives an indication of either its decision or preferred position, we will be in a position to put publicly our position on whatever the federal government might indicate.

The final point I will make is that I would not always believe what I read in the newspapers. With great respect to someone who has a background in journalism and media, whilst often it can have kernels of truth in it, occasionally it is far from the mark, so let's wait and see. As I said, we believe we have had productive discussions, and time will tell when we see a final decision from the federal government.

Bills

RETAIL TRADING BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:23): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the closing of retail shops in the metropolitan area of Adelaide on certain days, to repeal the Shop Trading Hours Act 1997, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:24): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the Retail Trading Bill 2018, which will give choice back to South Australians by reforming our outdated shop trading laws in the current Shop Trading Hours Act 1977. As part of the Liberal government's election platform, a commitment was made to deregulate South Australia's shop trading hours, reduce red tape and liberalise trading times by allowing non-exempt stores across the state to remain open for a broader range of hours every day of the week, including

public holidays, whilst maintaining restrictions on Christmas Day, Good Friday and ANZAC Day morning.

Numerous reviews and reports from commonwealth government organisations, such as the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) and the Productivity Commission, continue to call for further deregulation of trading hours around Australia, particularly in South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland. In late 2013, the commonwealth government undertook a comprehensive review of competition laws and policy in Australia. A review panel, chaired by Professor Ian Harper, undertook the review, and the final report was released in March 2015.

The regulation of retail trading hours was identified as an area for immediate reform by the panel. The report noted that South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland retain significant restrictions on retail trading hours and that these restrictions are a regulatory impediment to competition by raising barriers to expansion. The panel claimed that consumer preference should be the best driver of trading hours and that the growing use of online shopping is undermining the intent of restrictions on retail trading hours for bricks and mortar retailers.

The panel noted that independent and small businesses are able to differentiate their offerings to fulfil consumer demands and compete in the face of deregulated trading hours. Further, where restrictions apply to a particular sector or type of business, this can result in consumers having less flexibility and choice. The panel recommended that any remaining restrictions on retail trading hours in Australia should be removed, with the possible exception of Christmas Day, Good Friday and the morning of ANZAC Day, and should be applied broadly to avoid discriminating among different types of retailers.

The panel highlighted the experience of deregulation in Tasmania in 2002. Following deregulation, between the years 2003 and 2006, Tasmania experienced 25 per cent growth in retail sales compared with Australia-wide growth of 16 per cent. Despite concerns that deregulation would lead to a loss of employment, because of a decline in the number of smaller retailers, this was not the case. The panel cites ABS data that showed employment in retail trade in Tasmania increased significantly from 23,500 total jobs in November 2002 to 25,500 total jobs in November 2003. This represented 8.3 per cent retail jobs growth over the year, which was greater than the 4.3 per cent average jobs growth across all Tasmanian industries.

Consumer surveys of public opinion have also demonstrated strong support for changes to shop trading laws. A recent report commissioned by Business SA and conducted by the University of South Australia's Institute for Choice was published in March 2018. It found that three-quarters of South Australian consumers wanted to see changes to shop trading hours, including staying open later on weekends, opening earlier on Sunday mornings and allowing suburban centres to open on public holidays.

The Institute for Choice found that 75 per cent of the South Australian consumers surveyed wanted to see changes to shop trading hours. In regional areas, where there are no regulations, residents did not want to see any changes. The current restrictions on trading hours provided by the act apply to non-exempt shops in a prescribed or proclaimed shopping district. The prescribed shopping districts are the central business district, the tourist precinct, the metropolitan shopping district and the Glenelg tourist precinct. These are collectively defined as the greater Adelaide shopping district.

In the greater Adelaide shopping district, current permitted trading hours for non-exempt shops are: Monday to Friday, 12 midnight until 9pm; Saturday, 12 midnight until 5pm; and Sunday, 11am until 5pm. Car and boat dealerships in all districts have greater restrictions and can only trade until 6pm, Monday to Wednesday; until 9pm on Thursday and Friday; and until 5pm on a Saturday, but cannot trade on Sundays and public holidays.

Hardware, furniture, floor coverings and auto parts stores in all districts can also open at 9am on Sundays and public holidays, except for Good Friday, Christmas Day and not before 12 noon on ANZAC Day. Non-exempt shops in the CBD tourist precinct can also trade from 11am until 5pm on all public holidays except Good Friday, Christmas Day and not before 12 noon on ANZAC Day.

Exempt shops in the CBD and any area can trade on any day they wish, including Good Friday, Christmas Day and before 12 noon on ANZAC Day.

Importantly, the metropolitan shopping district consists of the metropolitan area, which includes the City of Onkaparinga in the south and the corporation of the Town of Gawler in the north. As a result, Gawler, Aldinga, McLaren Vale and Willunga are in the metropolitan area and are regulated by shop trading hours. However, Mount Barker, Tanunda and Victor Harbor are deregulated and can trade every day of the year at any time. Proclaimed shopping districts are regional districts that came into existence upon an application being made by local councils to the minister, who could then proclaim a town or group of towns as a shopping district. There was once as many as 69 proclaimed shopping districts, but there are now only three. These are Millicent; Grace (the town of Mallala); and Binnum (the towns of Binnum, Frances and Kybybolite).

Over the years, the other 66 proclaimed shopping districts have been progressively abolished by the minister at the request of the relevant councils. Most recently, in 2017, 32 of the remaining 35 districts were abolished by the previous minister. This was as a result of the Local Government Association being notified that a number of retail stores in South Australia had inadvertently been trading for many years outside of the trading hours prescribed by the act. The Local Government Association then liaised with the minister and subsequently wrote to each regional council to suggest an application be made to abolish the proclaimed shopping district, resulting in the shops being able to trade at any time they wished.

Of the remaining proclaimed shopping districts, Millicent is the only one where the act has any real relevance. In a proclaimed shopping district, the permitted trading hours for non-exempt shops are: Monday to Friday, except Thursday, 12 midnight until 6pm; Thursday, 12 midnight until 9pm; and Saturday, 12 midnight until 5pm. A shop in a prescribed or proclaimed shopping district that is an exempt shop does not have to comply with any of the above restricted trading hours. Exempt shops include:

- shops with a floor area of 200 square metres and which does not adjoin to a storeroom with a floor area exceeding one half of the floor area of the shop;
- shops which sell foodstuffs with a floor area that does not exceed 400 square metres and which does not adjoin to a storeroom with a floor area exceeding one half of the floor area of the shop, noting that in order to meet this exemption the foodstuffs must be 80 per cent or more of the aggregate price of goods sold at the shop during the immediately preceding period of seven consecutive days;
- hairdressers;
- a shop that sells sporting goods within the premises of a squash centre, ten pin bowling alley or golf club, noting that in order to meet this exemption the goods must be 80 per cent or more of the aggregate price of goods sold at the shop during the immediately preceding period of seven consecutive days; and
- a garden shop, noting that in order to meet this exemption the goods displayed at the garden shop and purchased in the immediately preceding period of seven consecutive trading days must be 80 per cent or more of the aggregate price of all goods selected from goods displayed at the garden shop.

Shops that sell:

- antiques (other than coins or stamps); or
- live fish, fish food, aquariums, accessories for aquariums; or
- paintings, reproductions, drawings, etchings, pottery, sculptures, artefacts, wood carvings, leatherware, weavings, handmade goods of glass, iron, copper or silver; or
- newspapers, books, periodicals, greeting cards, posters, wrapping paper, stationery; or
- pharmaceutical preparations, cosmetic and toilet requisites, first aid requisites, medical and surgical appliances; or

- fresh flowers, living plants, floral arrangements, wreaths; or
- non-alcoholic drinks, ice cream, confectionery, light refreshments; or
- household pets, pet foods and accessories, garden supplies; or
- food for consumption on the premises or prepared at the premises for consumption off the premises; or
- souvenirs of a time, place or occasion identified as such by inscription, stamping or marking; or
- cigarettes, cigars, tobacco, smoker's requisites; or
- caravans; or
- trailers.

I note that is the list in the act of exempt shops. I hope you are keeping up. But then there is a caveat, noting that in order to meet this exemption the sale of all or any of the goods in each category of shop that I have just listed must be 80 per cent or more of the aggregate price of goods sold at the shop during the immediately preceding period of seven consecutive days.

The 80 per cent/20 per cent rule on paper may appear simple. However, in practice its application makes little sense, and in some instances, such as applying it to a petrol station, it can become problematic based on anomalies between the act and the Shop Trading Hours Regulations 2003. For example, it is ironic that a hardware store is able to use the 80 per cent/20 per cent rule to sell other goods such as vacuum cleaners, toasters and kettles, yet a store that specialises in those household items cannot trade the same hours as the hardware store.

Furthermore, as to the definition of 'hardware and building materials', which is required to determine the 80 per cent portion when applying the 80 per cent/20 per cent rule, itself is a legacy item and was inserted based on the goods that were sold by the former Harry's Hardware Store in Mile End. One would barely consider some of these items in today's environment as 'hardware and building materials'.

Similarly, it is ironic that a furniture or floor covering shop is allowed to trade on public holidays and at 9am on a Sunday morning and may use the 80 per cent/20 per cent rule to sell manchester and soft furnishings, yet other homewares stores selling manchester and soft furnishings cannot trade at the same hours. Key features of the reform bill include:

- 24-hour trading for non-exempt shops every day of the year except Christmas Day, Good Friday and not before 12 noon on ANZAC Day;
- the definition of a non-exempt shop now uses a staffing model as opposed to a floor area provision as provided in the current act. A non-exempt shop must have no more than 20 persons employed and working in the shop and the total number of persons employed and working in the same shopkeeper shops in South Australia cannot exceed 100. The staffing model option is used in all other states;
- one shopping district: the metropolitan area (regional South Australia will continue to be fully deregulated with the three remaining country proclaimed shopping districts abolished);
- a streamlined list of exempt shops that now only includes shops that could exceed staffing level parameters and, based on current practices, are likely to trade on the days that remain restricted;
- an exemption power, either on the minister's own initiative or upon application, which can be issued for the whole or a part of the metropolitan area, a specified class of shops and individual shops;
- existing employee protections on Sunday remain and an emphasis on the current protections already afforded to public holidays by the National Employment Standards under the commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 is included as a note within the bill; and

- existing protections for tenants, being that a landlord cannot include a lease term requiring a shop be open on a Sunday, remain for the metropolitan area.

The bill does not mandate when shops can and cannot open. The decision of when to operate is left with the shop owners, similar to how businesses operate in most industries. Businesses will be provided with greater choice as to when to open, potentially providing more opportunities to employ more staff and create new jobs.

Consumers will benefit by having one set of trading rules for all shops covered by the bill, making it clearer and easier to choose when and where to shop. Essential services provided by shops such as chemists and petrol stations, along with shops expected to be unrestricted such as cafes, restaurants, take-away food outlets and shops that primarily offer goods on hire and that only sell goods by retail as an incidental activity, have been specifically listed as exempt from the bill. This will provide reassurance that access to these services at unusual hours is not limited by the bill.

The reforms will also bring South Australia more in line with trading hours offered around Australia. Over the years, South Australia has seen incremental change to its shop trading laws. When the current act came into operation, non-exempt shops could only trade until 6pm on four weeknights, until 9pm on the designated late-night trading night and until 12.30pm on Saturday. The definition of an exempt shop was determined by both floor area (200 square metres) and staffing levels. There were also restrictions on the sale of red meat and trading hours for hairdressers, regardless of size and staff. Most of regional South Australia was also regulated by the act.

In 1980, the act was amended to allow hardware stores to trade on weekends and most public holidays, and the floor restriction for an exempt shop selling foodstuffs (i.e. supermarkets) increased from 200 square metres to 400 square metres. In 1990, Saturday afternoon trading until 5pm commenced. In 1994 and 1995 respectively, the restrictions on the sale of red meat and regulated hours for hairdressers were removed.

In 1995, Sunday trading from 11pm until 5pm was introduced to the Adelaide CBD, then there was gradual change in the late 1990s that enabled shops in the city and suburbs to trade until 9pm on all weeknights. In 2000, the Glenelg tourist precinct was established so that non-exempt shops in the Jetty Road area were able to trade on a Sunday, the same as the Adelaide CBD. In 2003, the act was again amended to extend Sunday trading to the rest of metropolitan Adelaide and staffing level restrictions were removed from the definition of exempt shop. Finally, 2012 saw the introduction of trading on most public holidays in the Adelaide CBD.

During debate on virtually all of these changes to shop trading hours, there were claims that smaller retailers would be significantly disadvantaged and many would be driven out of business. However, the reality has been that smaller and independent retailers have not only survived but have continued to thrive. Of course, similar claims are being made about this bill.

It is interesting to note that in the last year independent retailers are opening new stores in competition to large retailers in deregulated areas such as Mount Barker and the Adelaide CBD. In fact, in recent years two of our state's most successful independent retailers have opened a number of interstate stores in deregulated markets, where they compete successfully with large retailers.

If this bill is not passed by the parliament then, sadly, the existing act, with all its anomalies and legal uncertainties, will have to be enforced. A recent audit by SafeWork SA has demonstrated that a number of independent retailers have been trading outside of the hours permitted by the legislation. In particular, they have been trading on public holidays, before 11 am on Sundays and after hours during the week and on weekends.

It is clear that these independent retailers are responding to consumer demand for extended trading hours, and have made the decision that it is in their commercial interests to do so. Clearly, their employees have also been happy to work during these extended trading hours. Some retailers have resorted to using curtains, screens or boxes to block off part of their floor area in an attempt to reduce their floor area below 200 square metres, or 400 square metres in the case of a supermarket, to enable them to trade on a public holiday.

There is also legal argument about how the actual floor area of a shop should be calculated. For example, it has been argued that areas such as entrances, trolley areas, counters and areas

behind the deli counter should be excluded from the floor area calculation. There has also been legal argument about the interpretation of the 80 per cent rule for petrol stations and inconsistencies between the act and regulations made under the act.

Retailers like Harvey Norman have had to build stores in South Australia with roller doors inside because on public holidays they are not allowed to sell electrical goods but are allowed to sell furniture. There are many other similar anomalies and legal uncertainties with the current legislation. However, if the parliament rejects this bill then, as I said earlier, there will be no alternative other than to enforce compliance with the current act. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure. The restrictions in the Act apply to shops in the metropolitan area which is defined by reference to the list of council areas set out in Schedule 1 of the measure. The provision also defines the concept of an 'exempt shop', which includes premises licensed under the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*, certain smaller shops (identified by reference to the number of employees working in the shop), chemists, petrol stations, cafes, restaurants and take away food outlets, hire shops and shops of a class prescribed by regulation. Under clause 6 of the measure, it is a defence to an offence to prove that the shop was an 'exempt shop' at the relevant time (or that a Ministerial exemption under clause 10 applied).

Part 2—Shop trading hours

3—Hours during which shops may be open

This provision requires shops situated in the metropolitan area to be closed on Good Friday, 25 December and until 12 noon on 25 April.

4—Lease or agreement terms relating to Sunday trading

This clause replicates section 13A(1), (2) and (4) from the current *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977* in respect of shops in the metropolitan area.

5—Staffing on Sundays

This clause is similar to section 13A(3) of the current *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977* but applies in respect of shops in the metropolitan area and uses language similar to that used in the *NSW Retail Trading Act 2008*.

Part 3—Offences

6—Offences

This clause sets out offences for the purposes of enforcing the restrictions in the Act.

7—Advertising

This clause sets out an offence that is the same as the offence under section 14A of the current *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977*.

Part 4—Inspectors

8—Inspectors

Persons appointed by the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Fair Work Act 1994* as inspectors under that Act are inspectors for the purposes of this measure and the Minister may appoint other inspectors.

9—Powers of inspectors

This clause sets out powers of inspectors in the same terms as section 8 of the current *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977*.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

10—Exemptions

This clause allows the Minister to grant exemptions from the Act or provisions of the Act.

11—Power of delegation

The Minister may delegate functions or powers under the measure.

12—Regulations

This clause allows for the making of regulations for the purposes of the measure.

Schedule 1—The metropolitan area

This schedule lists the council areas that comprise the *metropolitan area* for the purposes of the measure.

Schedule 2—Repeal and transitional provision

1—Repeal

The *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977* is to be repealed.

2—Inspectors

People currently appointed as Inspectors under the *Shop Trading Hours Act 1977* will be taken to have been appointed as inspectors under this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks.

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 May 2018.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:48): I rise to support this bill and commend the government for taking steps to fulfil their election promise. This bill will enable the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (ICAC) to hold hearings in public if they believe it is in the public interest to do so. Public hearings can only relate to issues of misconduct and maladministration, not corruption matters.

The commissioner, Bruce Lander, has previously called for the power to hold public hearings. The previous government opposed this, and a bill introduced by the Hon. Dennis Hood last year was unsuccessful. I have explored this issue before, and had previously been advised by parliamentary counsel that it would have been very difficult to provide those powers in a private members' amendment bill. The Hon. Dennis Hood should be commended for persisting with the issue to bring a bill to the parliament, just as the current government should be commended for bringing it to this parliament now.

It is extraordinary that there are circumstances where senior public servants make recommendations to the government but are completely ignored. It is no wonder that many public servants no longer give frank and fearless advice—they fear that their contracts will not be extended if they speak up. These people were appointed for their experience and expertise, and any suggestions should at least be given the courtesy of being considered rather than dismissed outright.

The ICAC has investigated several high-profile matters in the past few years, most notably the matter regarding abuse at Oakden and the sale of government-owned land at Gilman. There was incredible public interest in these matters and, should the commissioner think it is appropriate, hearings on issues such as these should be held in public.

Public hearings are permitted by other corruption investigation bodies around the country, and South Australia's ICAC Act has often been touted as being the most secretive in the nation. This bill will be an important step towards transparency for the people of South Australia. Again, I support the bill and commend the government for making these amendments to the act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DISHONEST COMMUNICATION WITH CHILDREN)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 June 2018.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:51): Today, I rise to indicate Labor's support for the Criminal Law Consolidation (Dishonest Communication with Children) Amendment Bill 2018. Under this legislation, any adult who lies about their age or pretends to be someone other than who they are and attempts to meet with a child, or intends to commit an offence, will be severely punished. This important legislation, which has widely become known as Carly's law, has come about in the most tragic of circumstances. There is nothing anyone anywhere, including those in this chamber, can say to take away the pain and anguish that Carly Ryan's family and friends will experience for the rest of their lives after the heart-wrenching death of Carly in 2007.

This amendment bill introduces two new offences. The first new offence will apply whenever an adult communicates with a child and lies about their age or identity and seeks to meet with that child. The second new offence is where an adult communicates with a child and lies about their age or identity with the intent of committing an offence against that child.

The previous Labor government supported the introduction of this legislation in the lead-up to the 2018 election, and Labor in opposition continues to support this legislation. It is important that this law be implemented. This legislation will make it an offence, with a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment, for a person to communicate with a child and lie about their age, or about being someone else, and if they arrange to meet with that child.

It will also make it an offence with a harsher and higher penalty of 10 years' imprisonment for a person to communicate with a child and lie about their age or who they are with the intention of committing an offence against that child.

The internet is an important and positive resource in our modern lives but it does pose dangers to children, and it is vital that we as adults and parents become more aware of those dangers and that those who enforce the law are armed with laws that will punish those who misuse this valuable resource. It is an unfortunate aspect of the world we live in that not everyone's actions are steeped with good intentions. For predators who intend to harm our children, the opportunity for anonymity provided by electronic means is all too easy now through the internet.

I would like at this time to pay tribute to the hard and tireless work of the Carly Ryan Foundation. The foundation was formed by Carly's mum, Sonya, who has been in parliament for most of today patiently waiting for this law to progress. As the website for the Carly Ryan Foundation says, the 'aim is to create awareness and educate children and parents using the internet' so that the work will be able to expose the multiple identities of those who seek to harm young children. I have had the good fortune to meet with the Carly Ryan Foundation now on a number of occasions since taking up the position of shadow attorney-general, and I can personally attest to the amazing work they do.

I recently attended one of the foundation's forums on online safety held at Mount Barker by current candidate and recent former member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie. That forum took the mainly parents who were there through a lot of the dangers posed online and I must say that I learnt quite a number of things about the different ways that young people communicate. With three young children myself, I found startling some of the ways that I was not aware of that young people communicate, such as apps hidden as calculators. As they always have, young people deceive their parents, but in an online environment it can lead to very tragic consequences.

The next morning around the breakfast table, my wife and I talked to our three young boys about their online activities. They all play a game called Fortnite, which I had not heard of until I went to the forum in Mount Barker hosted by the Carly Ryan Foundation. I must admit that I knew absolutely nothing about it until the Carly Ryan Foundation forum and talking to my boys about it the next morning. I do not know a lot about it, but I gather you create characters, go online and then have adventures with people all around the world.

In discussing it with my boys, they told me that they regularly interact with a very young person from somewhere overseas. They said, 'It's another young person, Dad.' I asked, 'How do you know that?' They said that their age is in their online name, so they have to be the 13 year old that they say they are. They also talked about talking to someone from Brazil, who was a very nice person. I was absolutely stunned. I thought that we had done everything possible to make sure that they understood the dangers of online communication. It seemed to be a harmless game. I am sure there probably was not anything untoward in the couple of communications they have had, but it is just so easy these days to not understand that.

I think that the work the Carly Ryan Foundation does provides an immense resource for parents who do not understand what the latest technologies are and ways to help protect children. Moreover, I think the bill before us today helps give law enforcement all the tools they need should people have untoward intentions, as I so quickly found out could very easily be the case.

In a media statement about the introduction of this legislation released earlier this month, Sonya Ryan said, 'Knowing our home state will soon have a law named after my beautiful daughter that will help police catch predators before they harm children is an indescribable feeling.' To Sonya and all of those involved at the Carly Ryan Foundation, I think we will never know exactly the enormous difference that this will make to people. I think everyone in this place and in the other chamber should be proud to be associated with the passing of laws that will make an enormous difference. With that, I commend the legislation to the chamber.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:57): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support this bill. All members are familiar with the tragic case of 15-year-old Carly Ryan, who was murdered in 2007 by Garry Newman, a 50-year-old paedophile who posed as an 18-year-old musician from Melbourne. Newman deceived Carly for 18 months through online contact and phone calls before ultimately meeting and murdering her.

This case touched us as a nation and we were collectively appalled by its deviousness and its brutality. Newman's deceptive actions of lying about his age to Carly and pretending to be someone other than he was, which ultimately led to Carly's death, are not currently crimes under existing state law and this bill fixes that deficiency. Carly's Law makes it illegal for a person to lie about their age to a child and then attempt to meet that child. By targeting the grooming and predatory behaviour, police will be able to intervene sooner to prevent harm to children.

The commonwealth parliament passed a federal version of Carly's Law last year and that means that police in South Australia will now have the choice to use either the commonwealth law or state law, depending on the nature of the offending and the evidence that they have gathered.

I was pleased this morning to meet with Sonya Ryan, mother of Carly and also the founder of the Carly Ryan Foundation, a non-profit charity that exists to promote internet safety. I am pleased that Sonya and her colleague Karina Natt are in the chamber today, as they see the culmination of their campaign to have Carly's Law passed in South Australia. I acknowledge their patience in what appears to be a very slow process as we legislate. On behalf of the Greens, I was pleased to offer Sonya our support for the legislation. I mentioned to her that we were very happy to see the bill passed, and to be passed unamended, but that as a lawyer I would need to raise a couple of technical issues for the attention of the minister.

Like most pieces of criminal legislation, the operational aspects will depend largely on the good judgement being exercised by law enforcement officers. That will be important because it seems to me that in this bill there is one potential anomaly that I think both the Attorney-General and the police need to be aware of, and that flows from the fact that—and it was news to me—apparently there is a variety of situations where people do lie about their age but with absolutely no criminal or wrong intent.

It has been put to me that a lot of people are now using dating apps, for example, as well as more traditional social media. I am told that it is not uncommon for young people to add a few years—in other words, to lie about their age—in order to try to meet someone a bit older and, similarly, I am told it works even more the other way, with people understating their age by a few years in order to increase their chances of meeting someone. When those two things collide there is, however remote, a technical possibility that a breach of the act could occur, despite no criminal intent.

That certainly was not the case in Carly Ryan's situation, where the murderer was 50 and pretending to be 18. As I say, I am not proposing to move any amendments. I do not want to undo the good work that has been done but I would invite the minister to address whether this is a potential anomaly or whether it is, in fact, a figment of a lawyer's robust imagination. However, in any event, I do not know if there is any fix that would work without undermining the intent, and absolutely no-one wants to do that.

I am prepared to trust that law enforcement officers will exercise common sense, that they will use these powers and these laws appropriately and that they will consider the harm that this bill is seeking to overcome when exercising their powers. I fully expect that is exactly how it will work in practice. In conclusion, I congratulate Sonya Ryan, I congratulate the Carly Ryan Foundation on what I think will be, in just a few minutes' time, the successful passage of this bill through both houses of parliament, and I commend the foundation on the work that it is doing to keep all of our children safe, especially in the growing online environment that is such a big part of young people's lives these days.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:02): I rise to also offer my support for this bill, which seeks to introduce some very important measures to protect children and adolescents from predators who seek to do harm to them. In fact, I cannot think of any reasons why members would not be supportive of the proposed legislation, given that there is an opportunity for us as legislators to take a proactive approach to ensuring the safety of our children and youth by enabling early police intervention in cases of suspected child grooming.

Indeed, presuming the bill receives passage, the Marshall Liberal government trusts that it will set a precedent with respect to addressing serious shortcomings in current laws throughout the nation, prompting other states and territories to implement similar changes within their own jurisdictions. I am sure members are aware that the bill before us is referred to as Carly's Law in memory of Carly Ryan, who was tragically killed at just 15 years of age by 50-year-old Garry Newman. I acknowledge Sonya Ryan in the gallery and would like to acknowledge the fine work that the Carly Ryan Foundation has done, and that has been mentioned by other contributors in this debate.

Garry Newman initially disguised himself or took on the alias, if you like, of an 18-year-old musician (online) and relentlessly pursued Carly before luring her to meet with him at Port Elliott, where he brutally assaulted her and left her to die. When police located Newman 11 days later, they discovered he had constructed no less than 200 fake online profiles through which he was engaging with other young girls, both in Australia and overseas.

In fact, most shockingly, at the time of his actual arrest Newman was found to be logged on to his computer, communicating with a 14-year-old girl in Western Australia. Thankfully, he was taken into custody and convicted before he was able to inflict any physical harm on her as well, but it is frightening to think about what could have transpired had it not been for the swift response and skill of our law enforcement agencies.

The bill before us creates two new offences, accompanied by harsh yet appropriate penalties, in my view. Firstly, it will be an offence for an adult to knowingly communicate with someone who is under the age of 17 whilst being deceptive about their age or identity and meets with or arranges to meet with that child. This offence will attract a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment. It will also make it an offence for an adult to communicate with a child whilst lying about their age or identity, who has the intention of committing a crime against that child. This has a maximum penalty of 10 years' imprisonment.

It is the Marshall Liberal government's sincere hope that these punitive sanctions will act as a strong deterrent for potential predators, fostering a safer online environment for the users of social media who are most vulnerable to being misled. Being a father myself—and no doubt other members of the chamber feel similarly—I find it particularly concerning to think of the ease of access these predators have to most people online, particularly teenagers and children. Indeed, because of an increasing number of social media platforms and other online applications, access is becoming easier not harder.

I was surprised to learn that there are now approximately 270 million fake or artificial Facebook profiles at any one time. One can only hazard a guess as to what percentage of those have been created for sinister purposes. Members present may also have seen reports in the media in just this last week of a relatively new app, which is gaining significant attention, called Monkey. Monkey's purported aim is to 'fill the loneliness void of teenagers' by encouraging complete strangers from all over the world to video chat with each other in short 15 second bursts. Although the intention of the app's creators may have been innocent enough, ironically the creators are just teenagers themselves.

Warnings by experts are now being issued to parents and guardians due to the propensity of older adults to utilise this method of communication, which may prove to be an attractive channel for paedophiles and other deviants to reach unsuspecting young people. Of course, given children are being given smart phones at increasingly young ages, presumably for safety reasons and with the right intentions by their parents and guardians, I was surprised to learn from a recent report that 60 per cent of parents are not monitoring the online activity of their own sons and daughters.

This is quite disturbing, as many young people are spending an exorbitant amount of time online, particularly to connect with friends via social media, and are therefore potentially unknowingly putting themselves in danger. In fact, the same report revealed that many teens are spending over three hours on social media per day, with 15 per cent indicating they are contacted by strangers on a 'daily basis'. Even more disturbing is the fact that 10 per cent admit to communicating with them.

If parents or guardians are not in a position to adequately supervise their children's online exploits then the laws we introduce and amend should serve to dissuade and prevent predators from contacting them in the first place. It is vital that we do so. This is one of the main reasons I successfully introduced legislation in 2010 to grant judges the power to ban convicted paedophiles from accessing the internet.

Prior to the passage of this legislation, paedophiles could be ordered to stop physically loitering around children, but there were no provisions to prevent predators from stalking and grooming adolescents or children online. As most would appreciate, eight years later these laws appear to be even more relevant, given the rapid technological advances giving way to the emergence of an ever expanding array of cyber communication methodologies.

I note that the proposed laws we are debating today have been carefully crafted to encompass the inevitable developments in communication to prevent any future loopholes, and this is important. It is often difficult for laws to keep pace with technological change, but the laws we have before us today I think at least attempt to do that. There should be no excuse for adults deceiving children in any circumstance whatsoever online, and there is certainly no excuse for legislators to neglect taking appropriate action wherever possible to mitigate its occurrence.

As we have discussed, the deceitfulness of deviant predators can be ruthless, callous and, unfortunately, life threatening. I firmly believe the Marshall Liberal government's bill is a vital key in curbing this unacceptable behaviour, and I am proud to hear the Attorney-General will be doing her best to have the same legislative framework implemented nationwide should it receive due passage in this place. I strongly support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon J.S.L. Dawkins.

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 June 2018.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:10): I rise on behalf of the Greens to indicate our support for the second reading of the Health Care (Governance) Amendment Bill. I note that the bill will seek to reform the South Australian health governance arrangements, and this legislation is the first of a suite intended to do that. This legislation seeks to create one statewide, three metropolitan and six regional LHNs and governing boards. It has the stated intent of devolving this decision-making and

responsibility to local levels, and this will of course involve significant planning and consideration of how our public health system will work as a whole.

I note that, in the election campaign, the Liberal then opposition took this as an election policy, so in that way it is no surprise to the Greens. Certainly, one of the four pillars of the Greens is grassroots decision-making, and as a member of the Transforming Health select committee I heard time and time again how centralised decision-making was not good for the state of our health system. On those basic principles, the Greens are certainly of a mind to support the devolution of decision-making and that real input at local levels.

The bill before us is the first, and while we have strong support for the intent of the bill, we note that there has been a lack of appropriate consultation in this particular situation. That is because, as an election promise, the government has sought to introduce this within that self-imposed 100 days time frame. The government has also put out an expression of interest advertisement, which has been the subject of not necessarily debate in this place, because we did not quite get to the point of the motion being debated, but certainly some conjecture about whether or not the advertisement of positions presupposed the passage of the bill before us.

I put on the record that the Greens were in no way cowed into submission in terms of supporting this bill. We are very happy to support the principle of this bill, regardless of an ad in a newspaper, be that *The Advertiser* or any of the regional newspapers, and we note that the expression of interest process did have that due deference for the work of the parliament.

I also note that applications for those positions closed last Friday, and it is intended that they will take those positions into being appointed at the end of this month. With limited sitting days, there is a time pressure here that is not ideal but is certainly not a reason not to support this bill today, and certainly the second reading is strongly supported.

The Greens have undertaken some consultation with the limited time frame that we have been given. We have had feedback from the ANMF of South Australia, and that feedback certainly has raised some concerns that we hope will be addressed. Today, we have had one amendment tabled from the government minister and a raft of amendments tabled in the last 20 minutes or so from the opposition.

The Greens will be ensuring that the feedback, which I am about to seek leave to table, will be taken on board by both the government and opposition in their contributions to this debate as we enter both the second reading conclusion and the committee stage. The ANMF outlines some of their concerns with regard to the requirements of the hospital boards, and noting the terms of the provisions with regard to clarity around direction and also a single-stream accountability. They also seek to ensure that the medical practitioners include nursing and midwifery in this level of governance. At this point, Mr President, I seek leave to table the correspondence of the ANMF with regard to this particular bill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you, Mr President. I continue. It will be no surprise that the Greens also contacted the Australian Medical Association of South Australia and similarly have received some feedback from that particular body. They note their concerns with the tight time frame. They have, indeed, exercised their view in the correspondence that it is disappointing that this time frame is so short. I also reflect on the AMA's diligence in going through their old records and referencing the Health Care Act debate of 2008. Indeed, I suspect they were similarly displeased with, while a longer time frame, the lack of consultation with regard to the act that now exists that brings us to the bill in terms of unpicking some of that work.

Certainly, both sides are not covered in glory in their consultation with bringing either of these governance models before this parliament. At this point, Mr President, I seek leave to table the correspondence of the AMA of South Australia, dated 18 June, with regard to the bill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The highlights of the AMA feedback are that the board membership should include medical practitioners, that doctors are needed in leadership roles and that consultation needs to be more adequately undertaken. They indicate their awareness that this

is stage 1 of this process, and we certainly will not be so relaxed and comfortable should a further bill come before this place without the appropriate level of consultation. The highlights of that particular submission included: a need for accountability, country services and relationships with metropolitan services, appointments to the board on merit being defined and provisions for that consultation and engagement strategy needing to be more inclusive.

Finally, it will come as no surprise to members that the Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia has also made a submission, at my behest. Having received this legislation, I undertook to contact stakeholders through my office. None of what I have tabled so far has been received from either the government or opposition, and I just note that.

The feedback from the Health Consumers Alliance does express their grave disappointment. I put on record that the Greens echo that grave disappointment of a lack of a consumer voice in this debate. We will certainly be prosecuting their concerns as we enter the committee stage. There are several recommendations here that I would like the minister to respond to in the summing-up speech, or certainly by clause 1 of this bill. I seek leave to table the feedback on the draft Health Care (Governance) Amendment Bill from the Health Consumers Alliance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Members will be very happy to hear that that was the last of the documents for which I have sought leave to table today. I have done this so that all members of this council and the other place have the benefit of those documents in guiding our deliberations on what has been set as a very short time frame.

With goodwill and good spirit, the Greens support the second reading of this bill. We will be looking to the Labor amendments. So far, from a brief glance, some of them seem to be quite constructive amendments that we will likely support, and we encourage the government to provide that feedback we have requested to the issues raised in those tabled documents as we progress this in a good spirit to ensure that that local governance in our health system addresses some of the concerns that the Greens and others have raised.

Just this week we have heard that some patients have been waiting more than 16 years for hospital treatments in South Australia. We have seen that Transforming Health, the most significant health reform in this state, was undertaken on a falsehood of a supposed 500 avoidable deaths, which were 500 fictional avoidable deaths. We will be testing both the new minister who has promised a greater transparency and clarity and we welcome the provisions for publication of real-time operational information that is contained in this bill.

But we will be holding both sides to account. We will be holding the Labor opposition to account for the failures of Transforming Health and the way that was undertaken and rolled out. Anyone who read the non-existent—well, you could not read the minutes of the consultations with regard to the closure of the Repat because they did not actually take any. Anyone who observed that process of how the Repat was closed and how the Jamie Larcombe Centre was created would not be able to sustain an argument that that was done with community support. We will hold this new minister to account for the same standard that he has set for the now opposition. With those few words, I indicate we look forward to the committee stage.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DISHONEST COMMUNICATION WITH CHILDREN)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:22): I thank honourable members for their contribution to the bill and in general terms for their support for the passage of this important legislation through both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council as expeditiously as it has been handled. The Attorney-General, who has spoken both publicly and in the parliament often on the issues canvassed by the legislation and on the importance of this particular piece of legislation,

said in her second reading—and I thought I need only quote from part of her second reading, not all of it—in order to summarise the government's position in her summation of the second reading:

Again, I turn to Ms Ryan and thank her for the tireless work the Carly Ryan Foundation does to protect children, to make them aware and to educate them and, indeed, their parents when they use the internet. Again, it has been pointed out the internet is a valuable tool in communication and education but when somebody mischievously and with a prurient interest enters that space for their own gratification and sexual appetite against the interest of children that must be stopped and that is something we hope this bill will be effective in doing.

I think in that sentence or two, the Attorney-General summarised not only her position but the position of the Marshall Liberal government. We are pleased that members who have spoken in both houses of parliament have spoken in support of the legislation and we look forward to its speedy passage through the committee stage this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT FEDERAL DIVERSITY JURISDICTION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2018.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:27): I rise today to indicate the Labor opposition's support for the Statutes Amendment (SACAT Federal Diversity Jurisdiction) Bill 2018. This statutes amendment bill deals with the High Court decision of *Burns v Corbett*, which has resulted in the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal potentially being unable to exercise its jurisdiction in relation to, particularly, residential tenancy matters where one party resides interstate. The bill allows that, where SACAT is now potentially unable to exercise its jurisdiction, the Magistrates Court will effectively be swapped in to consider the dispute with the same powers and, as I understand it and the minister might confirm, the fees of SACAT.

Advice provided by the Attorney-General's Department shows that there are around 700 cases potentially impacted by the *Burns v Corbett* High Court decision. The opposition has been advised that these cases largely fall into the category of disputes where interstate landlords are seeking to either evict tenants or recover unpaid rent. The High Court decision potentially also impacts on other matters within SACAT's jurisdiction, which involves the exercise of judicial powers and involves residents of different states. However, the advice received through the Attorney-General's Department suggests that SACAT is yet to identify any other matters outside the residential tenancies area that may be impacted.

Officers from the Attorney-General's Department have also advised the opposition that the implementation of this bill will not have a resourcing impact on the Magistrates Court, as SACAT officials will be appointed as auxiliary magistrates. The Attorney-General, or whoever her representative is in this place, might be able to expand on these two points in their second reading response or in the committee stage, namely, what other matters might be affected by the High Court decision and how that resourcing will work.

I am also advised that other jurisdictions are affected by the High Court decision in different ways; for example, Victoria is currently considering how to deal with the matter. QCAT is a traditional jurisdiction rather than an administrative jurisdiction and therefore may not be affected, and it appears that WA and the Northern Territory do not have bodies that are affected. With those words, I indicate Labor's support for this bill and look forward to the government answering those questions in the second reading sum-up.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:30): I rise in support of this bill. The bill will allow for residential tenancy matters to be transferred to the Magistrates Court if a situation arises where the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, otherwise known as SACAT, would not be able to hear the matter.

I understand there is a need for this to occur due to a High Court decision that found that the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal, or NCAT, did not have the authority to hear matters that require them to exercise federal judicial powers. This came to light because the NCAT had to hear a dispute between residents of different states. The matter was referred to the High Court, which found that NCAT did not have the authority to hear the matter.

As there is no other jurisdiction in South Australia that can hear residential tenancy matters, this bill is a pre-emptive measure to ensure that South Australia will not be caught out if similar matters are presented to SACAT. I understand that any matters transferred to the Magistrates Court will have the same fee structure as if it were to be heard at SACAT, so members of the community will not be financially disadvantaged.

The court will also have the same powers and functions as SACAT conferred upon it. I understand that without this bill the community may face some issues with landlords being unable to take action against tenants under the Residential Tenancies Act. The government has shown great forethought in moving this amendment, and I support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

FARM DEBT MEDIATION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 17:36 the council adjourned until Wednesday 4 July 2018 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***MINISTERIAL STAFF****11 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17 May 2018).**

1. What are the names, titles and salaries of ministerial staff working for the minister at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?
2. What are the names, titles and salaries of departmental staff working in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Details of ministerial staff located in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018 as follows:

Name	Title	FTE	Salary
Gino De Gennaro	Chief of Staff	1.0	\$160,000
Julian Robertson	Senior Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$132,000
David Siow	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000
Cristalle Vandenberg	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000

The following information outlines the titles, classification and salaries of departmental staff working in my office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018.

Title	FTE	Classification	Salary
Office Manager	0.9	ASO8	\$99,455
EA to Minister	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Senior Business Support Officer	1.0	ASO4	\$72,616
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	Trainee	\$33,856

An FOI application was received by the Hon. K. J. Maher on 21 May 2018 requesting similar information. Names of all staff have been provided in a response dated 6 June 2018.

MINISTERIAL STAFF**13 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17 May 2018).**

1. What are the names, titles and salaries of ministerial staff working for the minister at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?
2. What are the names, titles and salaries of departmental staff working in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Details of ministerial staff located in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018 as follows:

Name	Title	FTE	Salary
Gino De Gennaro	Chief of Staff	1.0	\$160,000
Julian Robertson	Senior Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$132,000
David Siow	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000
Cristalle Vandenberg	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000

The following information outlines the titles, classification and salaries of departmental staff working in my office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018.

Title	FTE	Classification	Salary
Office Manager	0.9	ASO8	\$99,455
EA to Minister	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543

Title	FTE	Classification	Salary
Senior Business Support Officer	1.0	ASO4	\$72,616
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	Trainee	\$33,856

An FOI application was received by the Hon. K. J. Maher on 21 May 2018 requesting similar information. Names of all staff have been provided in a response dated 6 June 2018.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

35 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (30 May 2018).

1. What are the names, titles and salaries of ministerial staff working for the minister at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?

2. What are the names, titles and salaries of departmental staff working in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Details of ministerial staff located in the minister's office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018 as follows:

Name	Title	FTE	Salary
Gino De Gennaro	Chief of Staff	1.0	\$160,000
Julian Robertson	Senior Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$132,000
David Siow	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000
Cristalle Vandenberg	Ministerial Adviser	1.0	\$109,000

The following information outlines the titles, classification and salaries of departmental staff working in my office at any stage between 18 March 2018 and 15 May 2018.

Title	FTE	Classification	Salary
Office Manager	0.9	ASO8	\$99,455
EA to Minister	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Ministerial Liaison Officer	1.0	ASO6	\$94,543
Senior Business Support Officer	1.0	ASO4	\$72,616
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	ASO2	\$52,315
Correspondence Officer	1.0	Trainee	\$33,856

An FOI application was received by the Hon. K. J. Maher on 21 May 2018 requesting similar information. Names of all staff have been provided in a response dated 6 June 2018.

LAND TAX

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (15 May 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Growth in land tax revenue in a financial year is impacted by various factors. These factors include growth in site values as estimated by the Valuer-General, land tax threshold indexation (based on average growth in site values as determined by the Valuer-General) and changes in the composition of the underlying land tax base.

If it is estimated that total land tax revenue growth will exceed estimated CPI growth in an upcoming financial year and a decision is made to cap revenue growth at that estimated CPI level, this would imply that land tax bills, on average, could only increase by a maximum of CPI growth.

This could be achieved by adjusting land tax rates and thresholds or capping all land tax bills at the estimated CPI growth rate. Each option would result in different distributional effects among taxpayers and could necessitate an adjustment for taxpayers following the end of the financial year to reflect actual experience (e.g. actual site value and CPI growth in the financial year).

If total collections are capped at CPI, then when total land tax collections are forecast to increase by more than CPI in the coming year, rates and thresholds would need to be adjusted to ensure estimated collections did not exceed the cap. This would require a judgement to be made about which rates or thresholds would be adjusted. These

adjustments would assist in limiting overall collections but would not avoid the potential for the land tax liability of individual ownership to increase by more than CPI.

Alternatively, a decision to cap the growth in individual land tax liabilities at CPI would result in inconsistent treatment between landowners and equity issues. Land tax has a progressive rate structure, meaning that larger landholdings pay more tax than smaller ones. A cap would erode the application of a progressive rate structure as the tax treatment between taxpayers would become inconsistent.

If the site value of an ownership increased by more than CPI due to an improvement in the value of the land within the ownership or a change in the composition of the ownership (e.g. an increase in the number of properties), this ownership would be liable for less tax compared to another ownership with the same site value that did not benefit from the same appreciation in its landholdings.

For example, under a CPI capping policy, an ownership that experienced an increase in its site value from \$1 million to \$1.1 million between 2016-17 and 2017-18 would have received a land tax bill that was capped at \$8,865 in 2017-18 (assuming a 2% CPI cap). In comparison, an ownership with a site value of \$1.1 million in 2017-18 that did not experience any site value appreciation from the previous year would have received a land tax bill of \$10,137.

A scheme which caps growth in liabilities at CPI would therefore provide the greatest benefit to those landholders that experience high levels of site value appreciation above CPI growth. However, due to the large differences in liabilities that could occur for ownerships with the same site value, this could be perceived as effectively penalising landholders who experience little or no site value appreciation.

To minimise the impact of bracket creep, land tax thresholds in South Australia are currently indexed in line with average growth in site values as determined by the Valuer-General. This works to offset the impact of bracket creep where ownerships move in line average property values.

The Liberal government has also committed to cutting land tax bills. From 1 July 2020, the tax-free threshold will be increased to \$450,000, up from the current threshold of \$353,000 applicable in 2017-18. This will mean that thousands of land tax ownerships will no longer be liable for land tax. It will also provide an ongoing reduction in land tax for all other ownerships that remain liable for tax. The government has also committed to cutting the land tax rate from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent for ownerships valued from just over \$1 million up to \$5 million.

ELECTORATE OFFICES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (17 May 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I am advised:

1. The briefing provided to the former treasurer by Electorate Services was dated 17 March 2017.
2. The lease expiry date of the current King electorate office (former Wright electorate office) is 30 June 2019.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS INCIDENT

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (29 May 2018).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Minister for Child Protection has advised:

1. The family is known to the Department for Child Protection.
2. Attempts have been made to provide support to the family however I am unable to detail individual investigations, which are confidential to protect the child and young people involved.

The Department of Human Services has advised that:

3. The property where the incident took place is not owned by Housing SA

BRABHAM SUPERCAR

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (30 May 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): Brabham Automotive Holdings Pty Ltd was awarded a grant of up to \$1,350,000 (excluding GST) from the Future Jobs Fund by the former government in December 2017.

The grant assists the company with the cost to manufacture, assemble and commercialise the Brabham branded bespoke motorsport track cars and supercars from its premises in Edinburgh Park, South Australia. Specifically, the grant is being provided to the company to develop a production and showroom facility, manufacture test vehicles and establish a driver development program within South Australia.

The state's grant, whilst capped at \$1.35 million, will be paid to the company as reimbursement of up to 50% of its expenditure on the project against performance milestones to establish the Edinburgh Park facility, purchase tooling and manufacture and launch the Brabham cars.

The company's project is expected to create 52 new jobs over the next five years, with failure to meet agreed full-time equivalent employee (FTE) targets resulting in pro rata clawback of the grant.

The grant deed has been executed and a copy will be available on the SA Tenders and Contracts website.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (31 May 2018).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As an operational matter, the Clinical Director of Surgery has been involved in discussions on this matter and is aware of the work being undertaken to address the issue.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (5 June 2018).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Premier's office was made aware of screening to protect patient privacy on the afternoon of Thursday 31 May 2018.

Neither my office nor myself were advised of the erection of the screening before Thursday 31 May 2018.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. I.K. HUNTER** (5 June 2018).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The following additional consultants, medical officers and nurses are currently in the process of being recruited to support the expansion of the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department:

- 4.57 FTE ED Consultants
- 8.15 FTE ED Medical Officers
- 9.45 FTE Nurses

An additional 9.33 administration staff are also being recruited to release time of clinical staff to care and to support patient care in the clinical area.

CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (5 June 2018).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Chemotherapy Treatment at Home is offered at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital (since 1996), through the existing hospital chemotherapy unit. In addition, the Flinders Medical Centre provides low risk subcutaneous cytotoxic treatments through its Hospital at Home service.

J&H WILLIAMS

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (6 June 2018).

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): I have been advised:

1. The company was placed into liquidation, not voluntary liquidation. In accordance with the Public Sector Act the Department of State Development was advised on 1 June 2018.
2. Following the liquidators being appointed on 6 June 2018.
3. The company is continuing to trade as the liquidator seeks a buyer to purchase the business. There are 13 employees.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHAPLAINCY PROGRAM

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (6 June 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised of the following:

1. Program monitoring of the National School Chaplaincy Program (NSCP) is undertaken by the Department for Education within a risk management framework.

The department conducts a range of monitoring activities to verify that the NSCP services are delivered in accordance with the conditions of the project and goods and services agreements. Monitoring activities include:

- responding to concerns from members of the school community or seeking feedback from them to verify participation and progress
- examining school and service provider documentation associated with claims for payment
- conducting site visits to schools and service providers to review compliance with the project and goods and services agreements; and

- supporting structures such as the code of conduct. Site visits also provide an opportunity for principals to express their satisfaction or concerns with the program regarding implementation and service delivery.

The department also undertakes desktop monitoring to oversee program delivery. Schools and service providers may be asked to provide additional information throughout the funding period, including:

- evidence of pastoral care worker minimum qualifications
- evidence of child related employment screening clearances
- certification forms signed by the principal against the program compliance requirements
- copies of school complaints registers
- follow up on resolution of complaints
- verification of details that have been provided in financial acquittal reports; and
- evidence of ongoing school community support for the program and the pastoral care worker via governing council meeting minutes and results of school parent surveys.

2. All complaints regarding the National School Chaplaincy Program or a pastoral care worker within the school should be directed to the school principal or a complaints officer designated by the school principal in the first instance as the school principal has an overall duty of care and is ultimately responsible for all students and staff within the school community.

Complaints are also able to be lodged with the service provider (according to the service provider's complaint process) who is the employer of the pastoral care worker providing the NSCP service in the school. School principals and service providers are expected to notify the department of complaints. School principals also notify the service provider (as the employer) of any complaints about the pastoral care worker/NSCP service in the school.

If a complainant is not satisfied that their complaint has been resolved at the local level, they can seek assistance from the Education Complaints Unit. The Education Complaints Unit is able to provide advice and support about issues behind a complaint, advocate with local sites to ensure that all options for resolution have been explored and objectively review complaints that have not been resolved at the local level, including through a formal review.

Complainants are also able to raise any concerns that they may have with the South Australian Ombudsman.

3. Records of complaints made at the site level are recorded by the individual site and reported on in the sites annual report. The department does not centrally collate records of complaints made to individual sites.

When complaints are received by the Education Complaint Unit they are recorded by the main topic of the complaint. The Education Complaint data is reported in the Department for Education's annual report.

4. The minimum qualifications requirements under the NSCP are determined by the Commonwealth Department of Education and Training. Service providers must comply with these requirements to participate in the program.

The department does not assess minimum qualifications or equivalency of qualifications as the service provider employing the pastoral care worker is responsible for determining this. Service providers must retain sufficient evidence of the pastoral care workers qualifications including assessment of equivalency. This documentation can be requested by the department as part of its monitoring activities.

As a minimum, pastoral care workers are required to hold qualifications in Certificate IV in Youth Work, Certificate IV in Chaplaincy and Pastoral Care; or an equivalent (or higher) qualification.

These qualifications ensure that pastoral care workers have the appropriate skills and competencies to deliver NSCP services. Some pastoral care workers hold qualifications above the minimum requirements appropriate with wellbeing services such as social work and psychology.

KANGAROO ISLAND

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (6 June 2018).

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): I have been advised:

As stated publicly, the state government has decided not to sell any land for the proposed golf course. The state government has agreed to negotiate a lease to KI Links Pty Ltd over the Crown land perpetual lease (Allotment 2 DP 76540), the landward portion of section 507 Hundred of Dudley and the eastern portion of Section 463 Hundred of Dudley. An approximately 50-metre wide strip of Crown land along the waterfront will be retained as a waterfront coastal reserve, providing ongoing public access to the coastline.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (21 June 2018).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department of Human Services has advised:

We believe in the principle that people with disability should have choice in the services they receive—this aligns with the guiding principles of the NDIS.

By supporting clients to enter the NDIS marketplace and gradually withdrawing state-run services, the state government is giving people with disability and their families the opportunity to have a new level of control over their service options (noting that housing arrangements are not directly affected).

On 12 June, staff and their representatives were informed that the public corporation established under the previous government would no longer be required. No announcement regarding the time frame had been announced.

Although a public corporation had been set up by the previous government, it was still in the establishment phase and did not yet have any operational control, so deciding not to proceed with it has had no direct impact on clients or employees.

An extensive consultation process commenced as soon as the government had an agreed direction out of cabinet on Monday 25 June.

Consultation will run over the coming months with clients, families and guardians, employees, unions and the sector and will inform how changes occur.

The consultation on the change process will be focussed on achieving the best possible outcomes according to these three guiding principles:

1. Continuity in quality client services and supporting client choice
2. Retention of skilled and experienced employees in the disability sector
3. Growth of the local South Australian non-government sector.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2018).

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): No-one in my office has, nor to my knowledge anyone on my behalf, held any discussions with potential candidates to be placed in South Australia's new overseas trade offices.